HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Friday, June 17, 1994*

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 17, 1994.

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

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

PRAYER

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

As we come together in this moment of prayer anticipating the crowded agendas of daily life, let us focus on thanksgiving, gratitude and praise—thanksgiving for the gift of the rest of the night and new energy for the day; gratitude for the gift of work and the privilege of service to the people of this Nation and praise to You, O God, for Your mighty acts of mercy and compassion to us and to all Your people. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from New York [Mr. KING] please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. KING 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces there will be five 1-minute speeches on each side.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE STATE SENATOR NORMAN MERRELL

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with sadness that I speak on the death of a good friend and Missouri State Senator, Norman Merrell. Senator Merrell was first elected to the Missouri State Senate in 1970, and served until his untimely death this past Tuesday. During his tenure, he served as President pro tem three times, and for a number of years was chairman of the Appropriation Committee.

Mr. Speaker, his accomplishments are many, but he will best be remembered for his devotion to the people of our State, his strength of character and his capacity for friendship. We entered the State senate together, and I had the privilege of serving with him for 6 years, 4 of which we shared an apartment in Jefferson City.

He was a true friend and wise adviser, Mr. Speaker, and I join his wife, Carlene, his children, and thousands of Missourians who will truly miss him.

Senator Norman Merrell reflected the very best of our State of Missouri.

AMERICA'S BUSIEST COMMUTER RAILROAD HAS STOPPED RUNNING

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

Mr. LEVY. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I rise to inform the House that negotiations between labor and management of the Long Island Rail Road have failed, that transport workers have struck, and that trains have stopped running. More than 254,000 daily commuters have been forced to find alternate transportation, and the metropolitan area's already overtaxed transportation infrastructure is being burdened further.

This is an emergency. That is why, on a bipartisan basis, Long Island's five-member congressional delegation is introducing legislation to get the parties back to the table and to get the trains running again. I ask my colleagues to support that legislation.

Strikes against America's busiest suburban commuter line wreak havoc on the day-to-day lives, not only of those who use the railroad, but of everyone who commutes between Long Island and New York City.

In addition—and it is critical that my colleagues understand this—when the Long Island Railroad stops running, parts of New York stop functioning. And, when parts of New York stop functioning, our Nation is crippled.

Please support our bipartisan bill to get the Long Island Railroad running again.

HEALTH CARE RESULTS, NOT PROMISES

(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, we have an opportunity in this session of Congress to make a significant, positive difference in the lives of our Nation's citizens. We have an opportunity to guarantee health care that can never be taken away.

Why must we change and improve our health care system? Because millions of Americans live in fear of losing their health coverage. Because millions more currently have no health insurance—and 80 percent of those are working Americans.

I say to my colleagues, "Under the President's plan, every American citizen is insured. Under the President's plan, health care can never be taken away. If you get sick, you are covered. If you have a pre-existing medical condition, you are covered. If you are laid off, change jobs or move to another community, you are covered. If you start your own small business, you are covered.

"You decide how and when and from which doctor you will get your health care. You pick the health plan that best serves your needs. It will be illegal for an insurance company to drop your coverage when you become sick or grow older."

Under the President's plan, Americans will gain important new coverage for prescription drugs, dental care, mental illness, and long term care in their homes.

The President has taken the leadership on this crucial issue. Now it is our turn. Let us seize this opportunity. It may not come our way again.

THE STRIKE BY THE LONG ISLAND RAILROAD MUST BE ENDED

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

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, the current strike by the Long Island Railroad is an economic catastrophe for the New York regions Long Island and New York City. I call upon my colleagues to support the emergency legislation which has been agreed to by the five-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Member Long Island delegation: Mr. LEVY, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. ACKERMAN, and I. I want to emphasize this legislation has also been approved by Governor Cuomo and Senator D'AMATO.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a regional issue. It is a national issue, and it is absolutely essential that President Clinton take a leadership role in focusing national attention on this issue.

I implore President Clinton to call on the Congress to adopt legislation so that all the Members know this is not a narrow regional issue. It is a national economic issue. It is essential to our region, yes, but it is also vital to this Nation that this strike be ended, that the strikers go back, the trains run and binding arbitration begin.

In 1987, Mr. Speaker, Congress did the right thing. It adopted legislation which ended the strike. I call upon the Congress to do so once again, and I call upon the President, most importantly, to provide the leadership which is absolutely necessary if this strike is to end and if our region is to be saved.

MFN STATUS FOR CHINA IS NONSENSE

(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, let us see if we can understand this:

United Nations experts say that if nuclear war would break out with North Korea, China would support North Korea. American experts even say that if nuclear war would break out, China would support North Korea over America economically, politically, and militarily.

So, what does this mean? It means that an American family buys a toaster. The dollars go to China, and they go into a Chinese bank and, if nuclear war breaks out, American dollars in Chinese banks will be used to help North Korea kill American soldiers.

Beam me up.

And what does Congress do about it?

Congress is approving most-favored-nation trade status for China.

To boot, their wages are 17 cents an hour.

Shame, Congress, Shame. This makes no sense. It is known as nonsense on the streets of America.

ST. PETER VERSUS THE IRS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, there are two certainties in life: death and taxes. The advantage of death is that judgment comes immediately. There is no surprise audit 2 years later.

Certainly there are no letters such as one my constituent received from the IRS. It reads, and I quote:

Our records show that you are a current or retired Federal employee. We previously billed you for your overdue Federal tax. We still have not received your full payment. The amount our records show you owe is $0.00.

That is right. The IRS sent a letter to a taxpayer telling him he does not owe them anything.

"Because you haven't paid," the letter states, "we must now consider filing a Notice of Federal Tax Lien." The IRS is going to place a tax lien on a taxpayer who does not owe them anything.

"We also must consider taking your wages, property, pension, or other assets to pay the amount you owe."—which, as the letter already stated, is nothing.

Honest, hardworking Americans being threatened by their own government for owing nothing.

Mr. Speaker, Saint Peter is charged with sorting thousands of souls every day, and I have yet to hear a complaint. The IRS is expected to review 100 million tax returns every year. It is obvious they are not up to the task.

Give me a break.

This is no way to run a tax system. Support the Traficant taxpayer protection bill and my taxpayer rights legislation.

Let us return sanity to our Tax Code.

□ 0910

DO NOT CHANGE REFUGEE LAWS FOR HOMOSEXUALS

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, as reported by CBS News, Attorney General Janet Reno announced a shocking new shift of refugee policy for the United States—from now on, homosexuals will be eligible to come to this country as political refugees.

Americans are proud of the way that this Nation has welcomed those who have risked their lives to fight for basic human rights in their home lands. However, bringing refugees to this country is an expensive process for American taxpayers, and those slots should be reserved for those who truly risk their lives to stand up for their fellow man.

We need to ask ourselves where our priorities are. Do we really want all our refugee slots for a region filled by those applying for asylum based on sexual preference while others who flee political persecution for their lives are turned down?

For anyone in the countries named by Attorney General Reno, the easiest road to a trip to the United States is claiming that one is a homosexual. This policy is subject to widespread abuse.

From the start, this policy is a bad idea, and I call on President Clinton to reject this proposal immediately.

MISSION OF THE HOUSE IS TO LEGISLATE, NOT TO RESCUE THE PRESIDENCY

(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, I think everybody understands that our mission here is to legislate. We have some challenging areas to legislate—crime, balancing the budget, health care. It is a very big agenda, and America is waiting and watching.

But too often around here I hear the sentiment that "We have to do this or that, we have got to get this bill out, and we have got to get something out there right now for the purpose of protecting the President." We read that justification in the press. In one of the most memorable votes we have ever seen during my time here on the budget, the idea was that "The Presidency will fail if we don't support the President's economic package."

It is not whether it is a good economic package; it is that "We've got to support it because it will fail or he will fail if we don't support his package." That happened in this Chamber and in the other body as well.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this is not going to be the driving force of our health care debate. Serious consequences are out there for every American's pocketbook and quality of life across this country. Our criterion must be good legislation. Health care is not a rescue mission for the White House. The White House does a great job saving itself.

AGRICULTURAL, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1995

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4554) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

□ 0913

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4554, with Mr. SPRATT in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Thursday, June 16, 1994, all time for general debate had expired.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on

the bill, H.R. 4554, and all amendments thereto, close at 2 p.m.

I have discussed this with the ranking minority member, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MYERS].

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, on the question about time, last night there was some type of agreement that we come in at 9 o'clock so we could get out by 2, and I certainly concurred in that because it was a good idea. But we have 14 amendments on this bill that are coming up. What happens then? Are we going to hopefully vote on this bill at 2 o'clock, or do we have to clear out of here by 2 o'clock?

What is the agreement? We will have a motion to recommit and then final passage, but will that come at 2 o'clock? What is the intent?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I think we should aim to complete all action on this bill by 2 p.m., which would mean calling some of the motions the gentleman has noted even before 2 o'clock.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. So, if I may continue, the idea is that we will be voting at possibly 1:30 or something like that? With 14 amendments, is there some way to manage it so we will not have 5 amendments left at 1:30 to consider? How are we going to allocate the time?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, last year we had success with every Member who offered amendments. Each Member agreed by unanimous consent to limit debate on each amendment. We did that in an orderly fashion.

I am going to propose, along with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], that each Member have some amount of specific time with the certainty that they will be allowed to offer their amendments.

I will add, though, that this is an open rule, so we suspect there could be anywhere from zero amendments up to 14 or more. So I ask for the indulgence and the cooperation of every Member to please come to the floor and alert the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and myself of their intentions so that we can allocate a period of time for Members to debate their amendments and we can call it to a vote, if necessary.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I will say that I concur with the sentiment just expressed by the chairman of the subcommittee. I think we have drawn the lines. All the Members are very familiar with the debate. There is not new material to be covered, so let us get on with the debate and get it done in a timely fashion and get out of here by 2 o'clock.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. By agreement, then, the House will complete its debate on this bill by 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4554

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—AGRICULTURAL PROGRAMS

PRODUCTION, PROCESSING, AND MARKETING

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Secretary of Agriculture, and not to exceed $75,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $2,801,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $11,000 of this amount, along with any unobligated balances of representation funds in the Foreign Agricultural Service shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, not otherwise provided for, as determined by the Secretary: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may transfer salaries and expenses funds in this Act sufficient to finance a total of not to exceed 35 staff years between agencies of the Department of Agriculture to meet workload requirements.

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND PROGRAM ANALYSIS

For necessary expenses of the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $5,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $5,795,000.

CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

For necessary expenses of the Chief Financial Officer to carry out the mandates of the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990, $580,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Administration to carry out the programs funded in this Act, $596,000.

AGRICULTURE BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES AND RENTAL PAYMENTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313 for programs and activities of the Department of Agriculture which are included in this Act, $106,571,000, of which $18,614,000 shall be retained by the Department of Agriculture for the operation, maintenance, and repair of Agriculture buildings: *Provided*, That in the event an agency within the Department of Agriculture should require modification of space needs, the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer a share of that agency's appropriation made available by this Act to this appropriation, or may transfer a share of this appropriation to that agency's appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 per centum of the funds made available for space rental and related costs to or from this account. In addition, for construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the programs of the Department, where not otherwise provided, $28,622,000, to remain available until expended; making a total appropriation of $135,193,000.

ADVISORY COMMITTEES (USDA)

For necessary expenses for activities of advisory committees of the Department of Agriculture which are included in this Act, $928,000: *Provided*, That no other funds appropriated to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to the Department of Agriculture for support of activities of advisory committees.

HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Department of Agriculture, to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961, $15,700,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That appropriations and funds available herein to the Department of Agriculture for hazardous waste management may be transferred to any agency of the Department for its use in meeting all requirements pursuant to the above Acts on Federal and non-Federal lands.

DEPARTMENTAL ADMINISTRATION

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For Finance and Management, $4,477,000, for Personnel, Operations, Information Resources Management, Civil Rights Enforcement, Small and Disadvantaged Business Utilization, Administrative Law Judges and Judicial Officer, and Emergency Programs, $21,710,000; making a total of $26,187,000 for Departmental Administration to provide for necessary expenses for management support services to offices of the Department of Agriculture and for general administration and emergency preparedness of the Department of Agriculture, repairs and alterations, and other miscellaneous supplies and expenses not otherwise provided for and necessary for the practical and efficient work of the Department of Agriculture, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 is for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be reimbursed from applicable appropriations in this Act for travel expenses incident to the holding of hearings as required by 5 U.S.C. 551-558.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations to carry out the programs funded in this Act, including programs involving intergovernmental affairs and liaison within the executive branch, $1,764,000.

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry on services relating to the coordination of programs involving public affairs, and for the dissemination of agricultural information and the coordination of information, work and programs authorized by Congress in the Department, $8,198,000, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which not to exceed $10,000 shall be available

for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, and not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used for farmers' bulletins.

OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Inspector General, including employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, $63,918,000, including such sums as may be necessary for contracting and other arrangements with public agencies and private persons pursuant to section 6(a)(9) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, and including a sum not to exceed $50,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; and including a sum not to exceed $95,000 for certain confidential operational expenses including the payment of informants, to be expended under the direction of the Inspector General pursuant to Public Law 95-452 and section 1337 of Public Law 97-98.

OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

For necessary expenses of the Office of the General Counsel, $25,992,000.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR ECONOMICS

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Economics to carry out the programs funded in this Act, $540,000.

ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the Economic Research Service in conducting economic research and service relating to agricultural production, marketing, and distribution, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, including economics of marketing; analyses relating to farm prices, income and population, and demand for farm products, use of resources in agriculture, adjustments, costs and returns in farming, and farm finance; research relating to the economic and marketing aspects of farmer cooperatives; and for analysis of supply and demand for farm products in foreign countries and their effect on prospects for United States exports, progress in economic development and its relation to sales of farm products, assembly and analysis of agricultural trade statistics and analysis of international financial and monetary programs and policies as they affect the competitive position of United States farm products, $54,306,000; of which $500,000 shall be available for investigation, determination, and finding as to the effect upon the production of food and upon the agricultural economy of any proposed action affecting such subject matter pending before the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for presentation, in the public interest, before said Administrator, other agencies or before the courts: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225): *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for analysis of statistics and related facts on foreign production and full and complete information on methods used by other countries to move farm commodities in world trade on a competitive basis.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS SERVICE

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Statistics Service in conducting statistical reporting and service work, including crop and livestock estimates, statistical coordination and improvements, and marketing surveys, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621-1627) and other laws, $81,424,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WORLD AGRICULTURAL OUTLOOK BOARD

For necessary expenses of the World Agricultural Outlook Board to coordinate and review all commodity and aggregate agricultural and food data used to develop outlook and situation material within the Department of Agriculture, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1622(g)), $2,498,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225).

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR SCIENCE AND EDUCATION

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, Extension Service, and National Agricultural Library, $520,000.

ALTERNATIVE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND COMMERCIALIZATION REVOLVING FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 5901-5908), $4,000,000 is appropriated to the Alternative Agricultural Research and Commercialization Revolving Fund.

AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to enable the Agricultural Research Service to perform agricultural research and demonstration relating to production, utilization, marketing, and distribution (not otherwise provided for), home economics or nutrition and consumer use, and for acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100, $693,977,000: *Provided*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for temporary employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $115,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed one for replacement only: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available to conduct marketing research: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of constructing any one building shall not exceed $250,000, except for headhouses or greenhouses which shall each be limited to $1,000,000, and except for ten buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $500,000 each, and the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building or $250,000, whichever is greater: *Provided further*, That the limitations on alterations contained in this Act shall not apply to modernization or replacement of existing facilities at Beltsville, Maryland: *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to replacement of buildings needed to carry out the Act of April 24, 1948 (21 U.S.C. 113a): *Provided further*, That the foregoing limitations shall not apply to the purchase of land at Parlier, California and Grand Forks, North Dakota: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $190,000 of this appropriation may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Science and Education for the scientific review of international issues involving agricultural chemicals and food additives: *Provided further*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing or operating any research facility or research project of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities as necessary to carry out the agricultural research programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, $23,400,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That funds may be received from any State, other political subdivision, organization, or individual for the purpose of establishing any research facility of the Agricultural Research Service, as authorized by law.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOSS

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goss: Page 12, line 22, strike "$23,400,000" and insert "$20,500,000".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment, and all amendments thereto, be limited to 10 minutes, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] to control 5 minutes and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and myself to control the remaining time.

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

There was no objection.

□ 0920

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I am merely standing here to clear up the record and close what I hope is a final chapter of what has been a very sordid story starting at the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, there are six specific points I wish to make here today about the inclusion of $2.9 million of taxpayer funds for the relocation of the Orlando Agricultural Research Service Station to Fort Pierce:

First, I hope to clear the record on the extent of support within the Florida delegation for this relocation. Contrary to testimony at hearings we are not unified on this matter. In fact, there are at least three camps within the delegation, with wide gulfs between them, representing different agricultural regions and interests in Florida.

Second, I also want to point out that this is not a partisan issue—we have experienced these difficulties over two successive administrations. It is however, a political issue, as shown by internal USDA documents and countless press stories and statements.

Third, my third point is that the site selection committee clearly and definitively placed another site above the one selected. That is not debatable—it happened—and it was deliberately covered up. It is only through the extraordinary unilateral efforts of a local newspaper's freedom of information request that the documents are now public which prove this. I will insert in the RECORD after my remarks the relevant documentation.

Fourth, because of the games played with the site selection process, it is the opinion of many southwest Florida agricultural leaders that the value to Florida agriculture of this research station has been significantly reduced by this USDA decision.

Fifth, I have suggested a better solution—a compromise—with the advantages of lower costs and better use of available resources; but so far we have heard nothing meaningful in response from USDA to this suggestion.

Sixth, my last, and most important point is that throughout this process, Members of Congress—myself included—have been deliberately, willfully, and knowingly misled by the USDA and its spokespersons. The record is clear: They were caught redhanded covering up, and they should be very red faced about it.

This is not a scandal about high living and special favors for senior members of USDA or illegal gifts for people who regulate their programs. I am not talking about that. I am talking about legitimate oversight of the U.S. Congress and the individual Members of it, and we expect cooperation and timely and complete and forthright responses from all executive branch agencies.

Today, in the overriding interest of avoiding protracted intrastate disharmony on this matter, I have decided not to proceed with this amendment, even though I believe $2.9 million would be better spent elsewhere. But I want the bureaucrats at the USDA to know that lying to Congress is no way to win friends on Capitol Hill. I want them to know that I will continue to work honestly, openly, and actively for the real victims of this process: The citizens of Immokalee. There are still ARS matters to be pursued there. And I want USDA to know that I will remember their sorry performance, disingenuousness, and inept management. In my view this chapter is a disgrace to public service. I hope they can do better.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR,
Washington, DC, September 11, 1992.

Decision Memorandum for the Secretary.

Through: Duane Acker, Assistant Secretary, Science and Education.

From: R.D. Plowman, Administrator.

Subject: Relocation of U.S. Horticultural Research Laboratory, Orlando, Florida.

BACKGROUND

The 40-year-old U.S. Horticultural Research Laboratory in Orlando, Florida, is in major need of modernization and is suffering from urban encroachment. Consequently, the Laboratory is no longer able to carry out its mission and serve the public as effectively as it has done in the past.

The Florida Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, representing a coalition of horticultural organizations in Florida, has supported the relocation of the U.S. Horticultural Research Laboratory, Orlando, to southern Florida so as to better serve the industry in future years. The Florida Congressional delegation supports this request and Congress has provided funds in our fiscal year 1993 budget toward planning for this relocation.

RECOMMENDATION

We have recently evaluated two sites in southern Florida that previously have been identified by the industry coalition as potential relocation sites. We recommend the Immokalee site in southwestern Florida as the site of choice but no announcement has been made of our preference. The attached briefing paper provides additional information.

We request that you consider our recommendation and make a public announcement of your decision.

Enclosure.

RECOMMENDATION ON RELOCATION OF U.S. HORTICULTURAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, ORLANDO, FL

BACKGROUND

The U.S. Horticultural Research Station, Orlando, Florida, was built in 1952 to help solve production and marketing problems of the U.S. citrus and other horticultural industries. There is now complete urban encroachment of the research facility, the citrus industry is moving to southern production areas of the State, the vegetable and nursery/ornamental industries are expanding in southern Florida, and there are many new production and marketing problems facing these expanding horticultural industries. There is also an increasing potential for exports, particularly for citrus and ornamental plants. A coalition of horticultural organizations in Florida, representing growers, processors, and marketing specialists, has requested the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) to relocate the Orlando Laboratory to southern Florida. The coalition first identified five potential relocation sites, then narrowed the sites to two—one at Ft. Pierce and one at Immokalee. Congress has provided funds toward the planning for relocation of the Orlando Laboratory.

EVALUATION OF SITES

Using previously established criteria for relocation of the Orlando Laboratory, ARS representatives twice visited the Fort Pierce and Immokalee sites. While both sites were found to be acceptable, the Immokalee site was found to be superior. Immokalee is centrally located to the existing citrus and vegetable production areas and would be centrally located to the anticipated future expansion of the citrus, vegetable, and nursery/ornamental industries. Approximately 175,000 acres already are in production, and State water-use management permits have already been approved for an additional 100,000 acres.

With major expansion of horticultural industries in Southwest Florida, research will be required to establish and maintain efficient and sustainable production systems. Areas of desired research would include land and water management systems so as to protect the environment, especially surface and ground water quality; biology of existing and potential agricultural pests to include insects, diseases, nematodes, and weeds; use of biological control and other integrated pest management techniques to control agricultural pests with a minimum use of pesticides; development of new improved citrus scion and rootstock varieties; new improved production systems for vegetable and nursery/ornamental crops; and improved marketing systems for all horticultural crops for both domestic and export markets. These distinct areas of proposed ARS research would be different from existing State programs but would complement University of Florida research on horticultural crops.

The South Florida Agricultural Council will purchase a 378-acre site at Immokalee and donate the land to the Department for the new research station. This site is one of the highest sites in Southwest Florida and would be better protected from flooding and freeze damage than the site at Fort Pierce. Based on the experience of the University of Florida, which recently built a Research and Extension Center at Immokalee, public utilities at the proposed ARS site could be provided at a reasonable cost and adequately maintained.

The University of Florida Research and Extension Center is located 3 miles from the Immokalee site and would provide the opportunity for cooperative research programs on all horticultural crops, as well as sugarcane. Since sugarcane is also expanding in Southwest Florida and ARS had a sugarcane research station at Canal Point, ARS could cooperate with the University of Florida on sugarcane research. ARS would also plan to cooperate with the Department of Environmental Sciences planned at the University of Florida Southwest Campus which is scheduled to be built 30 miles from Immokalee.

RECOMMENDATION

Immokalee is the site of choice for the relocation of the Orlando Horticultural Research Laboratory. It is suggested that after a public announcement is made on the relocation site, the Department thank the Florida coalition of horticultural industries and the entire Florida congressional delegation for their support of the relocation of the Orlando Laboratory and thank the South Florida Agricultural Council for offering to donate 378 acres of land. Contact for the Florida Coalition of Horticultural Industries: Mr. George F. Sorn, Executive Vice President, Florida Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 4401 E. Colonial Drive, P.O. Box 141055, Orlando, FL 32815-0155 (Telephone: 407-894-1351). Contact for the South Florida Agricultural Council: Mr. Tom Perry, Chairman, South Florida Agricultural Council, P.O. Box 68, LaBelle, FL. 33935 (Telephone: 813-946-0854).

FOLLOWUP ACTION

Arrangements should be made with the South Florida Agricultural Council for transfer of the Immokalee site to ARS. Some of the $1,270,000 identified in Orlando, FL, can be used for a pre-design study for the

Immokalee facility. A budget request will be required in fiscal year 1994 to provide funding for additional planning funds, followed by a later request for construction funds. Personnel could not be relocated from the Orlando Laboratory until after facility construction is complete and ready for occupancy. It might not be until 1997–1998 that relocation of the Orlando Laboratory would be complete.

SCORE SHEET FOR EVALUATION OF POTENTIAL RELOCATION SITES FOR THE U.S. HORTICULTURAL RESEARCH LABORATORY, ORLANDO, FL

The more important evaluation factors	Suggested weight	Site A	Site B
1. Potential of area for agricultural production over the next 50 years	5	XX	X
2. Proximity to existing or potential agricultural production areas of citrus, vegetable, and environmental horticultural crops	4	XX	X
3. Reduced likelihood of potential freeze damage to horticultural crops	4	X	X
4. Suitability of site to include size, configuration, frontage, soil type, drainage, lack of nematodes, etc	4	XX	X
5. Accessibility of site by agricultural community and potential visibility of laboratory facilities	3	X	X
6. Federal ownership of building site and field plots rather than lease. Outright Federal ownership is preferred	3	XX	X
7. Lack of easements or restrictive ordinances	3	X	X
8. Lack of industrial/urban encroachment or potential of such encroachment	3	XX	X
9. Proximity to State agricultural research and extension centers or other higher educational institutions	3	X	X
10. Presence of horticultural grower organizations in the area and potential of active involvement and support of such organizations for ARS and ARS/State cooperative research programs	3	X	X
11. Proximity to or accessibility of technical services needed to support agricultural research programs	2	X	XX
12. Anticipated ease of recruitment of professional staff. (Access to airports, hospitals, schools, churches, and other community services; quality of life available in the area; and other similar considerations.).	2	X	X
13. Access to public utilities	2	X	XX
14. Cost of land	2	X	X
15. Relocation costs of Orlando staff	1	X	XX

Site A is Immokalee, Site B is Fort Pierce; One X—Acceptable; Two X's—More acceptable.

Use of Evaluation Factors to Compare Immokalee and Fort Pierce Sites for Potential Relocation of the U.S. Horticultural Research Laboratory, Orlando, Florida

1. Potential of surrounding area for agricultural production over the next 50 years (Weight of 5).

Immokalee

Existing acreage of about 130,000 citrus (mostly young trees), 50,000 vegetables, and 3,000 nursery/ornamental crops.

Considerable potential for expansion of acreages over next 50 years with water use management permits already approved for an additional 100,000 acres of citrus.

Availability and relatively low cost of land and reduced likelihood of cold/freeze damage are primary reasons for anticipated expansion of Southwestern Florida agricultural production areas.

Many production and marketing problems anticipated as acreages of horticultural crops expand, thus increasing the need for research.

Fort Pierce

Existing acreage of about 220,000 citrus, 100,000 vegetables, and 10,000 nursery/ornamental crops.

Potential of urbanization could reduce agricultural production in area over next 50 years or certainly limit potential expansion.

Relatively high cost of land and higher potential threat of cold/freeze damage compared to the Southwestern Florida production area are considered to be primary reasons why expansion of horticultural crop production is not anticipated.

Since this is a well established production area for horticultural crops, many of the production and marketing problems have already been solved and there is comparatively less need for research.

2. Proximity to existing or potential agricultural production areas of citrus, vegetable, and environmental horticultural crops (weight of 4).

Immokalee

Site is centrally located within existing or potential areas of production for citrus, vegetable, and nursery/ornamental crops of Southwestern Florida.

Fort Pierce

Site is located in the extreme eastern edge of citrus production of Florida and near the extreme eastern edge of Fort Pierce-Indian River citrus production area. There is proximity to the vegetable and nursery/ornamental crops areas.

3. Reduced likelihood of potential freeze damage to horticultural crops (weight of 4).

Immokalee

Some threat of potential cold/freeze damage but the Immokalee area is located further south than the Fort Pierce area and is somewhat protected by the warm waters of the Gulf of Mexico. The Immokalee area has escaped much of the severe freeze damage experienced by citrus and other crops during freezes in recent years. This is the primary reason why plantings of citrus and other crops are being expanded in Southwest Florida.

Fort Pierce

The Indian River citrus production area and the Fort Pierce relocation site are both extremely close to the Atlantic Ocean and are reasonably well protected from cold/freeze damage. However, citrus and other crops planted just a few miles further inland are subject to cold/freeze damage.

4. Suitability of site to include size, configuration, frontage, soil type, drainage, lack of nematodes, etc. (weight of 4).

Immokalee

The 378 acre site in question is a single parcel of land and with good frontage on a major highway, good soil type, good soil drainage, absence of nematodes, and absence of other potential problems that would adversely affect field experiments.

Fort Pierce

A site of 150–180 acres would be made available. This site is in a single parcel of land and with good frontage on a major highway, good soil type, good soil drainage, absence of nematodes, and absence of other potential problems that would adversely affect field experiments.

Land in addition to the 150–180 acre site might also be available nearby, but this land would not be contiguous to the 150–180 acre site.

5. Accessibility of site by agricultural community and potential visibility of laboratory facilities (weight of 3).

Immokalee

Site is on a major highway which soon is to be increased to four lanes.

Site would be readily accessible and visible to the agricultural community.

Fort Pierce

Site is on a major highway and very close to interchanges with other major highways.

Site would be readily accessible and visible to the agricultural community.

6. Federal ownership of building site and field plots rather than lease. Outright Federal ownership is preferred (weight of 3).

Immokalee

The South Florida Agricultural Council would purchase the 378 acre site and make it available for research purposes at no cost to the Department. The Department would have outright ownership of land with a reversion clause if the land was no longer used for research purposes.

Fort Pierce

The University of Florida would make 150–180 acres of land available for research purposes under conditions of a long-term lease.

The St. Lucie County School Board has indicated that it would negotiate for use of additional land which is in close proximity to the University of Florida property.

7. Lack of easements or restrictive ordinances (weight of 3).

Immokalee

There are no known restrictive ordinances that would interfere with research programs.

Fort Pierce

There are no known restrictive ordinances that would interfere with research programs. However, restrictive ordinances might come with increased urbanization.

8. Lack of industrial/urban encroachment or potential of such encroachment (weight of 3).

Immokalee

Being in an agricultural area, this site lacks industrial/urban encroachment or the potential of such encroachment in the foreseeable future.

Fort Pierce

Future industrial/urban encroachment can be anticipated in the vicinity of this site and in the immediate surrounding area.

9. Proximity to State agricultural research and extension centers or other higher educational institutions (weight of 3).

Immokalee

The University of Florida plans to establish a new southwest campus in Fort Myers which would be about 30 miles from the proposed Orlando relocation site.

The University of Florida Southwest Florida Research and Education Center is located about 3 miles from the proposed relocation site.

Fort Pierce

The University of Florida Ft. Pierce Agricultural Research and Education Center is located about a mile from the proposed relocation site.

10. Presence of horticultural grower organizations in the area and potential of active

involvement and support of such organizations for ARS and ARS/State cooperative research programs (weight of 3).

Immokalee

There are organized and active horticultural grower organizations.

Fort Pierce

There are organized and active horticultural grower organizations.

11. Proximity to or accessibility of technical services needed to support agricultural research programs (weight of 2).

Immokalee

Technical services are available from the Ft. Myers area which is 30–35 miles away.

The Director of the University of Florida Southwest Florida Research and Education Center at Immokalee reports that his staff has had no difficulty obtaining technical services for their research programs.

Fort Pierce

Technical services are available from the Ft. Pierce area which is only several miles away.

12. Anticipated ease of recruitment of professional staff. (Access to airports, hospitals, schools, churches, and other community services; quality of life available in the area; and other similar considerations.) (weight of 2).

Immokalee

There would be no anticipated difficulties in recruitment of professional staff.

Fort Pierce

There would be no anticipated difficulties in recruitment of professional staff.

13. Access to public utilities (weight of 2).

Immokalee

Electric and telephone utilities are available at the site. Wells would have to be drilled and a self-contained waste water treatment facility would have to be built as was done for the University of Florida Southwest Florida Research and Education Center located about 3 miles away. Cost of putting in a well and building a waste water treatment facility is estimated to be between $500,000–$1,000,000.

Fort Pierce

Electric and telephone utilities are available at the site.

City water and sewer are available about 1 mile from the site and it would cost $800,000–$1,000,000 to bring them to the site.

14. Cost of land (weight of 2).

Immokalee

Land would be provided by the growers at no cost to the Department.

Fort Pierce

About 150–180 acres of land would be made available under long-term lease from the University of Florida at no cost to the Department.

Cost for leasing additional acreage from the St. Lucie County School Board would have to be negotiated separately and might incur additional expenses or certain future restrictions on the use of land.

15. Relocation costs of Orlando staff (weight of 1).

Immokalee

Relocation costs have not been estimated but would probably be more than the Fort Pierce site.

Fort Pierce

Relocation costs have not been estimated but would probably be less than for the Immokalee site because of the shorter distance from Orlando.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment at this time.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COOPERATIVE STATE RESEARCH SERVICE

For payments to agricultural experiment stations, for cooperative forestry and other research, for facilities, and for other expenses, including $171,304,000 to carry into effect the provisions of the Hatch Act approved March 2, 1887, as amended, including administration by the United States Department of Agriculture, penalty mail costs of agricultural experiment stations under section 6 of the Hatch Act of 1887, as amended, and payments under section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.); $20,809,000 for grants for cooperative forestry research under the Act approved October 10, 1962 (16 U.S.C. 582a–582–a7), as amended, including administrative expenses, and payments under section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.); $28,157,000 for payments to the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University, for research under section 1445 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3222), as amended, including administration by the United States Department of Agriculture, and penalty mail costs of the 1890 land-grant colleges, including Tuskegee University; $44,969,000 for contracts and grants for agricultural research under the Act of August 4, 1965, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i(c)); $103,123,000 for competitive research grants under section 2(b) of the Act of August 4, 1965, as amended (7 U.S.C. 450i(b)), including administrative expenses; $5,551,000 for the support of animal health and disease programs authorized by section 1433 of Public Law 95–113, including administrative expenses; $1,818,000 for supplemental and alternative crops and products as authorized by the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3319d); $400,000 for grants for research pursuant to the Critical Agricultural Materials Act of 1984 (7 U.S.C. 178) and section 1472 of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3318), to remain available until expended; $475,000 for rangeland research grants as authorized by subtitle M of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended; $3,500,000 for higher education graduate fellowships grants under section 1417(b)(6) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)), including administrative expenses, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); $1,500,000 for higher education challenge grants under section 1417(b)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)), including administrative expenses; $1,000,000 for a higher education minority scholars program under section 1417(b)(5) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)), including administrative expenses, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); $4,000,000 for aquaculture grants as authorized by section 1475 of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977 (7 U.S.C. 3322), and other Acts; $7,400,000 for sustainable agriculture research and education, as authorized by section 1621 of Public Law 101–624 (7 U.S.C. 5811), including administrative expenses; and $19,954,000 for necessary expenses of Cooperative State Research Service activities, including coordination and program leadership for higher education work of the Department, administration of payments to State agricultural experiment stations, funds for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), of which $9,917,000 shall be for a program of capacity building grants to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890 (7 U.S.C. 321–326 and 328), including Tuskegee University, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b), of which not to exceed $100,000 shall be for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; in all, $413,960,000.

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to carry out research related to the production, processing or marketing of tobacco or tobacco products.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For acquisition of land, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities and for grants to States and other eligible recipients for such purposes, as necessary to carry out the agricultural research, extension, and teaching programs of the Department of Agriculture, where not otherwise provided, $34,148,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

EXTENSION SERVICE

Payments to States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa: For payments for cooperative agricultural extension work under the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, to be distributed under sections 3(b) and 3(c) of said Act, and under section 208(c) of Public Law 93–471, for retirement and employees' compensation costs for extension agents and for costs of penalty mail for cooperative extension agents and State extension directors, $272,582,000; payments for the nutrition and family education program for low-income areas under section 3(d) of the Act, $61,431,000; payments for the pest management program under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,147,000; payments for the farm safety and rural health programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,988,000; payments for the pesticide impact assessment program under section 3(d) of the Act, $3,363,000; payments to upgrade 1890 land-grant college research and extension facilities as authorized by section 1447 of Public Law 95–113, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3222b), $7,901,000, to remain available until expended; payments for the rural development centers under section 3(d) of the Act, $950,000; payments for a groundwater quality program under section 3(d) of the Act, $11,234,000; payments for the Agricultural Telecommunications Program, as authorized by Public Law 101–624 (7 U.S.C. 5926), $1,221,000; payments for youth-at-risk programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $10,000,000; payments for a Nutrition Education Initiative under section 3(d) of the Act, $4,265,000; payments for a food safety program under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,475,000; payments for carrying out the provisions of the Renewable Resources Extension Act of 1978, $3,341,000; payments for Indian reservation agents under section 3(d) of the Act, $1,750,000; payments for sustainable agriculture programs under section 3(d) of the Act, $2,963,000; payments for extension

work by the colleges receiving the benefits of the second Morrill Act (7 U.S.C. 321–326, 328) and Tuskegee University, $25,472,000; and for Federal administration and coordination including administration of the Smith-Lever Act, as amended, and the Act of September 29, 1977 (7 U.S.C. 341–349), as amended, and section 1361(c) of the Act of October 3, 1980 (7 U.S.C. 301n.), and to coordinate and provide program leadership for the extension work of the Department and the several States and insular possessions, $7,117,000; in all, $429,200,000: *Provided*, That funds hereby appropriated pursuant to section 3(c) of the Act of June 26, 1953, and section 506 of the Act of June 23, 1972, as amended, shall not be paid to any State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, or the Virgin Islands, Micronesia, Northern Marianas, and American Samoa prior to availability of an equal sum from non-Federal sources for expenditure during the current fiscal year.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL LIBRARY

For necessary expenses of the National Agricultural Library, $17,845,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $35,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $900,000 shall be available pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2250 for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements.

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR MARKETING AND INSPECTION SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Marketing and Inspection Services to administer programs under the laws enacted by the Congress for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Agricultural Marketing Service, and Packers and Stockyards Administration, $605,000.

ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses, not otherwise provided for, including those pursuant to the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended (21 U.S.C. 114b–c), necessary to prevent, control, and eradicate pests and plant and animal diseases; to carry out inspection, quarantine, and regulatory activities; to discharge the authorities of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Act of March 2, 1931 (46 Stat. 1468; 7 U.S.C. 426–426b); and to protect the environment, as authorized by law, $438,651,000, of which $96,660,000 shall be derived from user fees deposited in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account, and of which $4,938,000 shall be available for the control of outbreaks of insects, plant diseases, animal diseases and for control of pest animals and birds to the extent necessary to meet emergency conditions: *Provided*, That, if the demand for Agricultural Quarantine Inspection (AQI) user fee financed services is greater than expected and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the Agency may exceed the AQI User Fee limitation by up to 20 per centum, provided such funds are available in the Agricultural Quarantine Inspection User Fee Account, and with notification to the Appropriations Committees: *Provided further*, That no funds shall be used to formulate or administer a brucellosis eradication program for the current fiscal year that does not require minimum matching by the States of at least 40 per centum: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $40,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for the operation and maintenance of aircraft and the purchase of not to exceed four, of which two shall be for replacement only: *Provided further*, That, in addition, in emergencies which threaten any segment of the agricultural production industry of this country, the Secretary may transfer from other appropriations or funds available to the agencies or corporations of the Department such sums as he may deem necessary, to be available only in such emergencies for the arrest and eradication of contagious or infectious disease or pests of animals, poultry, or plants, and for expenses in accordance with the Act of February 28, 1947, as amended, and section 102 of the Act of September 21, 1944, as amended, and any unexpended balances of funds transferred for such emergency purposes in the next preceding fiscal year shall be merged with such transferred amounts: *Provided further*, That appropriations hereunder shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the repair and alteration of leased buildings and improvements, but unless otherwise provided the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

In fiscal year 1995 the Agency is authorized to collect fees for the total direct and indirect costs of technical assistance, goods, or services provided to States, other political subdivisions, domestic and international organizations, foreign governments, or individuals, and such fees shall be credited to this account, to remain available until expended, without further appropriation, for providing such assistance, goods, or services.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, preventive maintenance, environmental support, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 2250, and acquisition of land as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 428a, $6,973,000, to remain available until expended.

FOOD SAFETY AND INSPECTION SERVICE

For necessary expenses to carry on services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, and the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, $430,929,000, and in addition, $1,000,000 may be credited to this account from fees collected for the cost of laboratory accreditation as authorized by section 1017 of Public Law 102–237: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $75,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and I want to thank the committee for all it is doing to improve the safety of meat and poultry.

Last year, three children in the Pacific Northwest died because they ate Government-approved hamburger that was contaminated with a deadly organism known as E. coli 0157:H7. Since then, Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy has done more than any Secretary in history to bring modern science to meat and poultry inspection in order to prevent more of these tragedies. No one can question his commitment to food safety.

But progress has been painfully, dangerously slow. According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, as many as 20,000 Americans may be infected with E. coli each year, and as many as 300 people die from this infection. There has been and will continue to be legitimate debates about the best ways to keep meat and poultry from contamination, but there has also been foot-dragging and resistance to basic reforms like microbial testing.

That is why the Appropriations Committee has directed USDA to work with other Federal agencies, to establish microbiological standards for food safety, and to sample for microbial pathogens in meat and poultry at critical points in processing to verify that pathogen levels are being controlled.

That is the kind of oversight and direction the Department clearly needs. It's the kind of leadership this Congress ought to be taking. I want to thank Chairman DURBIN and the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], for what they have done to improve our food safety system and protect America's children.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL GRAIN INSPECTION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the United States Grain Standards Act, as amended, and the standardization activities related to grain under the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946, as amended, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $20,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $11,325,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (76 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICES LIMITATION ON INSPECTION AND WEIGHING SERVICE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $42,784,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for Inspection and Weighing Services: *Provided*, That if grain export activities require additional supervision and oversight, or other uncontrollable factors occur, this limitation may be exceeded by up to 10 per centum with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

AGRICULTURAL MARKETING SERVICE

MARKETING SERVICES

For necessary expenses to carry on services related to consumer protection, agricultural marketing and distribution, transportation, agricultural cooperatives, and regulatory programs, as authorized by law, and for administration and coordination of payments to States; including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $90,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $55,728,000; including funds for the Wholesale Market Development Program for the design and development of wholesale and farmer market facilities for the major metropolitan areas of the country: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available pursuant to law (7 U.S.C. 2250) for the alteration and repair of buildings and improvements, but the cost of altering any one building during the fiscal year shall not exceed 10 per centum of the current replacement value of the building.

Fees may be collected for the cost of standardization activities, as established by regulation pursuant to law (31 U.S.C. 9701).

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $57,054,000 (from fees collected) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That if crop size is understated and/or other uncontrollable events occur, the agency may exceed this limitation by up to 10 per centum with notification to the Appropriations Committees.

FUNDS FOR STRENGTHENING MARKETS, INCOME, AND SUPPLY (SECTION 32) (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c) shall be used only for commodity program expenses as authorized therein, and other related operating expenses, except for: (1) transfers to the Department of Commerce as authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Act of August 8, 1956; (2) transfers otherwise provided in this Act; and (3) not more than $10,309,000 for formulation and administration of Marketing Agreements and Orders pursuant to the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended, and the Agricultural Act of 1961.

PAYMENTS TO STATES AND POSSESSIONS

For payments to departments of agriculture, bureaus and departments of markets, and similar agencies for marketing activities under section 204(b) of the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1623(B)), $1,200,000.

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for fiscal year 1995 the Agricultural Marketing Service shall recover the full cost of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, including legal services provided by the Office of the General Counsel.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DURBIN

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DURBIN: Page 26, strike lines 3 through 8, relating to the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930, and insert the following:

PERISHABLE AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES ACT

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 1995, the Secretary of Agriculture shall require persons filing complaints under section 6(a) of the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act, 1930 (7 U.S.C. 499f(a)), to include a filing fee of $60 per petition. In the event of further action on such a complaint during fiscal year 1995, the person or persons making the complaint shall submit a handling fee of $300, which shall be reimbursed by the commission merchant, dealer, or broker involved whenever the Secretary issues a reparation order under section 7 of such Act on the complaint. Such fees shall be deposited in the Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act Fund.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, if I might explain this amendment very briefly. The Perishable Agricultural Commodities Act provision was where the subcommittee was faced with the responsibility of finding additional revenue that we didn't have. I want to salute the Committee on Agriculture, which by unanimous consent yesterday proposed a filing and handling fee which will make up the difference that is needed to find this important program.

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

The compromise is OK with us on this side, and it is acceptable. We have no objection to it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PACKERS AND STOCKYARDS ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses for administration of the Packers and Stockyards Act, as authorized by law, and for certifying procedures used to protect purchasers of farm products, including field employment pursuant to section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $5,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $11,989,000.

FARM INCOME STABILIZATION OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS AND COMMODITY PROGRAMS

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs to administer the laws enacted by Congress for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Foreign Agricultural Service, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, $549,000.

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary administrative expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, including expenses to formulate and carry out programs authorized by title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1301–1393); the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1421 et seq.); sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590g–590o, 590p(a), 590p(f), and 590(q); sections 1001 to 1004, 1006 to 1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1501 to 1504, 1506 to 1508, and 1510); the Water Bank Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1301–1311); the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101); sections 202(c) and 205 of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act of 1974, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1592(c), 1595); sections 401, 402, and 404 to 406 of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2201 to 2205); the United States Warehouse Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 241–273); title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended (16 U.S.C. 3811 et seq.); and laws pertaining to the Commodity Credit Corporation, $717,958,000; of which $716,333,000 is hereby appropriated, and $1,036,000 is transferred from the Public Law 480 Program Account in this Act and $589,000 is transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation Program Account in this Act: *Provided*, That other funds made available to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for authorized activities may be advanced to and merged with this account: *Provided further*, That these funds shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $100,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That no part of the funds made available under this Act shall be used: (1) to influence the vote in any referendum; (2) to influence agricultural legislation, except as permitted in 18 U.S.C. 1913; or (3) for salaries or other expenses of members of county and community committees established pursuant to section 8(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for engaging in any activities other than advisory and supervisory duties and delegated program functions prescribed in administrative regulations.

CORPORATIONS

The following corporations and agencies are hereby authorized to make expenditures, within the limits of funds and borrowing authority available to each such corporation or agency and in accord with law, and to make contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out the programs set forth in the budget for the current fiscal year for such corporation or agency, except as hereinafter provided.

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION

ADMINISTRATIVE AND OPERATING EXPENSES

For administrative and operating expenses, as authorized by the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1516), $72,796,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $700 shall be available for official reception and representation expenses, as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1506(i): *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to offer a Federal crop insurance policy in counties on crops where a loss ratio, that has already been recalculated pursuant to law to reflect the premium rates issued by the Corporation for the 1994 crop year, is in excess of 1.10 more than 70 percent of the years that a policy has been offered since 1980: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to pay operating and administrative costs that exceed 31 per centum of premium to insurers of policies on which the Corporation provides reinsurance, except to reimburse said insurers for excess loss adjustment expenses as provided for in the Standard Reinsurance Agreement issued by the

Corporation: *Provided further*, That the second proviso shall not apply in any county affected if the Corporation has implemented a nonstandard classification system in such county for those individual farms that have experienced excessive losses since 1980 under which the premium rates, notwithstanding the provision of section 508(d) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, are increased over comparable rates effective for the 1994 crop, or the insured yields are decreased from comparable yields for the 1994 crop, or a combination of both, by an amount or amounts sufficient to ensure that an estimated loss ratio will not exceed 1.1 for the crop produced on such farms during the 1995 crop year.

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

Mr. Chairman, we face a peculiar situation here in the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation. This is a critically important program for producers and growers across the United States of America. Last year the gentleman from New Mexico and I tried to lead an effort to start reform of this program, and I think we can claim some measure of success. We said in last year's appropriation bill that if a producer had had an experience on his farm where he had lost his crop 70 percent of the time or more over the last 10 years, that the crop insurance premium charged to that producer in the future would have to reflect that fact.

□ 0930

The premium would have to be increased accordingly on that farm or the insurance would not be written. It is our belief, and I think that it is a reasonable one, that if someone loses a crop that often, God is trying to tell them something. The Federal taxpayer should not be held accountable when the good Lord has made it clear that they cannot grow that crop on that farm.

As a result of that measure by the subcommittee last year, the full Committee on Agriculture also embarked on a crop insurance reform undertaking. We can report to the Members of the House and taxpayers across this country that we have saved some $70 million this year in the expenses of this program and still have managed to maintain a good program across the United States.

I agree with President Clinton and his administration, Secretary Espy, that more needs to be done. What they have proposed is that we embark on a more ambitious crop insurance reform program. Our goal with this crop insurance reform program is to make sure that producers across the country still have the protection they need. They are in the business, of course, which is vulnerable to changes in weather and prices. We need to provide crop insurance so that should a bad year occur, the good farmer will not be wiped off the books.

What they have proposed is that basically we would eliminate Federal disaster payments which amounts to about $1 billion a year and instead come into the business of offering a very inexpensive crop insurance policy for producers across the country. What the administration proposes is there will be a $50 policy for each crop, no more than $100 per farm, that will provide basic protection for most producers. All would agree that $50 or $100 charge is a nominal filing fee and does not reflect the risk that is being assumed by the Federal taxpayer.

In return, we get out of the business of passing Federal disaster payments for agriculture. Of course, commercial insurance will still be available, and we will be involved in it. But this reform, I think, is a step in the right direction because this subcommittee faced extraordinary pressures in terms of reducing spending. We have included a provision in the Federal crop insurance section calling on the Committee on Agriculture to in fact reform crop insurance, use the $1 billion which had otherwise been paid for disaster payments to subsidize a new program but, in return, find more savings for the taxpayers across the country. We anticipate those savings will be in excess of $200 million.

I know that is a big responsibility for the Committee on Agriculture, but I believe they are up to the job. We are calling on them and hopeful that in the few months ahead, before we go to conference on this bill, that they will be able to institute meaningful crop insurance reform to give peace of mind to producers across this country, to save the Federal taxpayers money and to get us out of the business of Federal disaster payments except in the most extreme circumstances.

I would say that this is one of the more contentious items in the bill, but I think we have handled it in the only responsible way.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. STENHOLM

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. STENHOLM: On page 29, line 13, strike "$72,796,000" and insert "$62,796,000, *Provided*, that $12,000,000 be made available for the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service."

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is dealing with the exact same situation that the chairman has just talked about. We do have in the House Committee on Agriculture funds that have been provided under the budget agreement of this year in order to allow us and the appropriate committees to deal with the question of crop insurance reform. We all agree that it needs to be done.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], subcommittee chairman, is working on that at this point in time.

The amendment that I offer today is attempting to help another matter which is, as the chairman has pointed out over and over, the difficulty of funding all of the needed programs in the budget which has been made very difficult. And what I am suggesting today is that by taking an additional $10 million from the crop insurance side of the ledger and transferring that over to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, we will be able to see that the much-needed boll weevil eradication program be continued until we can find other ways to provide for that particular program. So that is the intent of my amendment. It is to transfer $10 million from the crop insurance account, which will provide $12 million additional for the boll weevil control program. And those monies, I am told, will be adequate to continue both programs in a way that will be acceptable to the agricultural community.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to where the gentleman is going with his amendment. I think it is a good one. It is a necessary one. I want to be assured, however, that the administrative funds for the reform and for the operation of the crop insurance program will be made whole. There is some $200,000,000.

Can I have that assurance?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman can, as far as I am concerned, because I share the exact same concern. That is certainly the intent of the author of this amendment. If it turns out that that cannot be done, then I would understand this amendment would be stricter in conference and could not be moved forward.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, with that assurance and the gentleman's word, and knowing how well he keeps it, I have no objection to the amendment.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad the gentleman from New Mexico made that point, because it is one that I agree with. I am very pleased with the response by the gentleman from Texas.

Let me add that I think that the program he is funding, the boll weevil eradication program, is an excellent program, is an excellent program. It is a good example of a program where the Federal taxpayers are making an investment that ultimately reduces the

use of agriculture chemicals and still makes certain that we are helping cotton growers across the United States. It is a program that has a proven record of success.

I like the gentleman's amendment, because it provides resources for this program.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, once again, we have proven if there is a will, there is a way.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and the ranking member. I certainly, as a member of the full Committee on Agriculture, will work with them to accomplish the spirit as well as the intent of this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] with a question about crop insurance reform.

We all agree something has to be done especially with the disaster payments which have been completely out of control. However, there is one category that both of us who represents river districts, where a crop is not planted, disaster payments then apply where you cannot insure a crop that cannot be planted in the spring because of floods. Is there going to be some way that we can still accommodate those farmers who, through no fault of their own, are flooded and cannot plant a crop?

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman completely. We both lived through this last year. Prevented plantings is a serious problem. The administration tried to respond to that crisis last year, but I think when we deal with crop insurance, we have got to find some way to address prevented planting. It is a very real problem caused by floods, wet weather, and some other natural disasters.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I hope the authorizing committee recognizes this and somehow takes care of these farmers. Hopefully, it does not happen that often, but it is still very real to that farmer who cannot plant a crop. They cannot plant rice, even, because we have too much water sometimes in the spring.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, certainly the authorizing committee I think, almost to a person agrees with this. And hopefully, as we get into the authorizing language, it will make the program work as all of us hope it would and do it under the restrained budget numbers that we have to operate under that we can accomplish just exactly that. It is a problem that is widespread and needs to be addressed.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, that is the main thing, so that we remember that there are those that will not fit into the insurance program as it exists today.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Chairman, on the subcommittee that is dealing with the crop insurance restructuring, I do want to say, I think it would be remiss if I did not say I am concerned that the funding level in this bill is not going to be adequate to fully cover the crop insurance reform as has been proposed by the administration. However, on the specific subject that the gentleman mentioned, prevented planting will be covered under the new provisions of the crop insurance proposal reform which is before the committee today.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, that is good. I thank the gentleman for that assurance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

FEDERAL CROP INSURANCE CORPORATION FUND

For payments as authorized by section 508(b) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act, as amended, $219,107,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND

REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES

For fiscal year 1995, such sums as may be necessary to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained, but not previously reimbursed (estimated to be $15,500,000,000 in the President's fiscal year 1995 Budget Request (H. Doc. 103-179)), but not to exceed $15,500,000,000, pursuant to section 2 of the Act of August 17, 1961, as amended (15 U.S.C. 713a-11).

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE FOR HAZARDOUS WASTE MANAGEMENT

For fiscal year 1995, the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not expend more than $5,000,000 for expenses to comply with the requirement of section 107(g) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 9607(g), and section 6001 of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 6961: *Provided*, That expenses shall be for operations and maintenance costs only and that other hazardous waste management costs shall be paid for by the USDA Hazardous Waste Management appropriation in this Act.

TITLE II—CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Natural Resources and Environment to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Forest Service and the Soil Conservation Service, $677,000.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

CONSERVATION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for carrying out the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) including preparation of conservation plans and establishment of measures to conserve soil and water (including farm irrigation and land drainage and such special measures for soil and water management as may be necessary to prevent floods and the siltation of reservoirs and to control agricultural related pollutants); operation of conservation plant materials centers; classification and mapping of soil; dissemination of information; acquisition of lands by donation, exchange, or purchase at a nominal cost not to exceed $100; purchase and erection or alteration or improvement of permanent and temporary buildings; and operation and maintenance of aircraft, $576,562,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b); of which not less than $5,756,000 is for snow survey and water forecasting and not less than $8,070,000 is for operation and establishment of the plant materials centers: *Provided*, That except for $2,399,000 for improvements of the plant materials centers, the cost of any permanent building purchased, erected, or as improved, exclusive of the cost of constructing a water supply or sanitary system and connecting the same to any such building and with the exception of buildings acquired in conjunction with land being purchased for other purposes, shall not exceed $10,000, except for one building to be constructed at a cost not to exceed $100,000 and eight buildings to be constructed or improved at a cost not to exceed $50,000 per building and except that alterations or improvements to other existing permanent buildings costing $5,000 or more may be made in any fiscal year in an amount not to exceed $2,000 per building: *Provided further*, That when buildings or other structures are erected on non-Federal land that the right to use such land is obtained as provided in 7 U.S.C. 2250a: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation may be expended for soil and water conservation operations under the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-590f) in demonstration projects: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225) and not to exceed $25,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That qualified local engineers may be temporarily employed at per diem rates to perform the technical planning work of the Service.

RIVER BASIN SURVEYS AND INVESTIGATIONS

For necessary expenses to conduct research, investigation, and surveys of watersheds of rivers and other waterways, in accordance with section 6 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1006-1009), $12,970,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $60,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WATERSHED PLANNING

For necessary expenses for small watershed investigations and planning, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1008), $10,546,000: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C.

2225), and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

WATERSHED AND FLOOD PREVENTION OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses to carry out preventive measures, including but not limited to research, engineering operations, methods of cultivation, the growing of vegetation, rehabilitation of existing works and changes in use of land, in accordance with the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act approved August 4, 1954, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1001-1005, 1007-1009), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and in accordance with the provisions of laws relating to the activities of the Department, $65,000,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b) (of which $10,000,000 shall be available for the watersheds authorized under the Flood Control Act approved June 22, 1936 (33 U.S.C. 701, 16 U.S.C. 1006a), as amended and supplemented): *Provided*, That, not to exceed 5 per centum of the foregoing amounts shall be available for allocation to any one State: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $200,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $1,000,000 of this appropriation is available to carry out the purposes of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (Public Law 93-205), as amended, including cooperative efforts as contemplated by that Act to relocate endangered or threatened species to other suitable habitats as may be necessary to expedite project construction.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND DEVELOPMENT

For necessary expenses in planning and carrying out projects for resource conservation and development and for sound land use pursuant to the provisions of section 32(e) of title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1010-1011; 76 Stat. 607), the provisions of the Act of April 27, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 590a-f), and the provisions of the Agriculture and Food Act of 1981 (16 U.S.C. 3451-3461), $32,845,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209): *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $50,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

GREAT PLAINS CONSERVATION PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry into effect a program of conservation in the Great Plains area, pursuant to section 16(b) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as added by the Act of August 7, 1956, as amended (16 U.S.C. 590p(b)), $11,672,000, to remain available until expended (16 U.S.C. 590p(b)(7)).

AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE

AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the program authorized in sections 7 to 15, 16(a), 16(f), and 17 of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act approved February 29, 1936, as amended and supplemented (16 U.S.C. 590g-590o, 590p(a), 590p(f), and 590q), and sections 1001-1004, 1006-1008, and 1010 of the Agricultural Act of 1970, as added by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1501-1504, 1506-1508, and 1510), and including not to exceed $15,000 for the preparation and display of exhibits, including such displays at State, interstate, and international fairs within the United States, $100,000,000, to remain available until expended (16 U.S.C. 590o), for agreements, excluding administration but including technical assistance and related expenses (16 U.S.C. 590o), except that no participant in the Agricultural Conservation Program shall receive more than $3,500 per year, except where the participants from two or more farms or ranches join to carry out approved practices designed to conserve or improve the agricultural resources of the community, or where a participant has a long-term agreement, in which case the total payment shall not exceed the annual payment limitation multiplied by the number of years of the agreement: *Provided*, That no portion of the funds for the current year's program may be utilized to provide financial or technical assistance for drainage on wetlands now designated as Wetlands Types 3 (III) through 20 (XX) in United States Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Circular 39, Wetlands of the United States, 1956: *Provided further*, That such amounts shall be available for the purchase of seeds, fertilizers, lime, trees, or any other conservation materials, or any soil-terracing services, and making grants thereof to agricultural producers to aid them in carrying out approved farming practices as authorized by the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, as determined and recommended by the county committees, approved by the State committees and the Secretary, under programs provided for herein: *Provided further*, That such assistance will not be used for carrying out measures and practices that are primarily production-oriented or that have little or no conservation or pollution abatement benefits: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 5 per centum of the allocation for the current year's program for any county may, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, be withheld and allotted to the Soil Conservation Service for services of its technicians in formulating and carrying out the Agricultural Conservation Program in the participating counties, and shall not be utilized by the Soil Conservation Service for any purpose other than technical and other assistance in such counties, and in addition, on the recommendation of such county committee and approval of the State committee, not to exceed 1 per centum may be made available to any other Federal, State, or local public agency for the same purpose and under the same conditions: *Provided further*, That for the current year's program $2,500,000 shall be available for technical assistance in formulating and carrying out rural environmental practices: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $15,000,000 of the amount appropriated shall be used for water quality payments and practices in the same manner as permitted under the program for water quality authorized in chapter 2 of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985, as amended (16 U.S.C. 3838 et seq.).

FORESTRY INCENTIVES PROGRAM

For necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, to carry out the program of forestry incentives, as authorized in the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2101), including technical assistance and related expenses, $6,625,000, to remain available until expended, as authorized by that Act.

COLORADO RIVER BASIN SALINITY CONTROL PROGRAM

For necessary expenses for carrying out a voluntary cooperative salinity control program pursuant to section 202(c) of title II of the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act, as amended (43 U.S.C. 1592(c)), to be used to reduce salinity in the Colorado River and to enhance the supply and quality of water available for use in the United States and the Republic of Mexico, $5,000,000 to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b), to be used for investigations and surveys, for technical assistance in developing conservation practices and in the preparation of salinity control plans, for the establishment of on-farm irrigation management systems, including related lateral improvement measures, for making cost-share payments to agricultural landowners and operators, Indian tribes, irrigation districts and associations, local governmental and nongovernmental entities, and other landowners to aid them in carrying out approved conservation practices as determined and recommended by the county ASC committees, approved by the State ASC committees and the Secretary, and for associated costs of program planning, information and education, and program monitoring and evaluation: *Provided*, That the Soil Conservation Service shall provide technical assistance and the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service shall provide administrative services for the program, including but not limited to, the negotiation and administration of agreements and the disbursement of payments: *Provided further*, That such program shall be coordinated with the regular Agricultural Conservation Program and with research programs of other agencies.

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the conservation reserve program pursuant to the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3831-3845), $1,743,274,000, to remain available until expended, to be used for Commodity Credit Corporation expenditures for cost-share assistance for the establishment of conservation practices provided for in approved conservation reserve program contracts, and for annual rental payments provided in such contracts, and for technical assistance.

WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Wetlands Reserve Program pursuant to subchapter C of subtitle D of title XII of the Food Security Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3837), $93,200,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That the Secretary is authorized to use the services, facilities, and authorities of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of carrying out the Wetlands Reserve Program.

□ 0940

Mr. DURBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I and title II be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order against the remainder of title I and title II? If not, are there any amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

TITLE III—FARMERS HOME AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY FOR SMALL COMMUNITY AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Under Secretary for Small Community and Rural Development to administer programs under the laws, enacted by the Congress for the Farmers Home Administration, Rural Electrification Administration, Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, and rural development activities of the Department of Agriculture, $568,000.

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

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, we are moving fast this morning.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Department Operations and Nutrition, I can tell you that legislation to authorize the collection of fees to pay for more of the current inspection system, as recommended by the Appropriations Committee, will be highly controversial. What we intend to do is to begin drafting legislation that would implement an improved inspection system that is scientifically defensible, addresses current risks to human health, and is acceptable, cost-wise, to taxpayers, consumers, and producers.

Until that time, I would like to ask the chairman if he would be willing to work with me in directing the USDA to review the manner in which it is presently providing inspection services, and to report to the Congress on how they intend to maintain or improve the integrity and effectiveness of the system, while operating within the proposed appropriation of $431 million which is in this bill?

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Texas. We have had a conversation on this issue, and I believe we see eye-to-eye on the principles we are seeking to achieve here.

As the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER] said earlier, it is important that we move to a new and better and higher level of inspection to give consumers confidence across this country. I think the Department of Agriculture, along with the Congress, has a unique opportunity, and I support the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. STENHOLM. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank the chairman of the committee for that.

I again assure him that our committee will begin as soon as possible, hopefully next week, in doing something that all parties have been interested in doing, and in so doing, perhaps we can be helpful to the subcommittee in the otherwise difficult task of stretching out the available funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION

The Secretary may transfer funds from the Farmers Home Administration in this Act to fund the Rural Development Administration, as authorized by law.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATION AND FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION

RURAL HOUSING INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, to be available from funds in the Rural Housing Insurance Fund, as follows: $2,400,000,000 for loans to section 502 borrowers, as determined by the Secretary, of which $1,000,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; $35,000,000 for section 504 housing repair loans; $15,915,000 for section 514 farm labor housing; $30,000,000 for section 515 rental housing; and $632,000 for site loans: *Provided*, That up to $48,650,000 of these funds shall be made available for section 502(g), Deferral Mortgage Demonstration.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendments and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc and considered as read.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: On page 42, line 12, strike "$2,400,000,000" and insert "$2,323,339,000". On page 42, line 16, strike "$30,000,000" and insert "$220,000,000". On page 42, line 23, strike "$282,640,000" and insert "$268,105,000". On page 43, line 2, strike "$15,750,000" and insert "$115,500,000".

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, the amendment increases the section 515 rural rental housing loan program by $190,000,000, from $30,000,000 up to $220,000,000. To offset this, the amendment decreases section 502 subsidized single-family housing loans by $76,661,000, from $1,400,000,000 down to $1,323,339,000.

In terms of cost, this amendment reduces outlays for the section 502 program by $11,970,000 and increases outlays for the section 515 program by exactly the same amount. Therefore, there is no net cost as a result of this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, very briefly, the section 515 program under the Farmers Home Administration is a program which builds multifamily housing in rural America for Americans, usually senior citizens, but not necessarily, who are in lower income categories. In this subcommittee, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and I directed our investigators to take a look at the program, and they investigated it in 12 different States.

They found examples in some States, such as Florida, of excellent administration of the program. They found examples in other States which clearly were not what we wanted to see, and we felt the program was wanting.

Therefore, in our subcommittee markup we reduced the appropriation for this important program to $30 million. I might add that it is about $540 million this fiscal year, so the Members can see this is a dramatic change.

Our purpose, Mr. Chairman, was to alert both the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs, which is reauthorizing the program, as well as all parties interested in this program, that it was time for real reform, so we can tighten up some of the concerns we have about this program.

The reason I am supporting this amendment at this moment to restore the level of funding to $220 million is because of the response not only from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] in the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, but also from all of the representatives in the various groups interested in this program. They have come forward in a very constructive manner and have agreed with the conclusions of the committee. They are setting out to reform it, and I think, frankly, that is what we all had hoped would happen.

Mr. Chairman, let me add this caveat. If after the reauthorization is passed and we have not solved the problems, I will be on my feet next year to make certain that this program does not receive the level of funding it has in this year's bill, but I am confident that that will not occur. That is why I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON].

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

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take the 5 minutes. I want to say that we concur on this side with the amendment. I think it is a good amendment, and it is a good program. We have to issue a wake-up call to not only the people handling this thing but the agencies who have the oversight responsibility, the people who are handling it, the contractors, and the rest of the people who use the program. It is an essential one for rural communities. It has been a good program, but it has some problems. We want the reform to take place. It is a good transfer of the funding. We have no objection to it, and support the amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, today, Representatives THOMPSON, CLYBURN, and I have offered an amendment to restore funding for the Farmers Home Administration section 515 Rural Rental Housing Program. We know fiscal year 1995 budgets are tight, and this amendment

will not increase fiscal year 1995 outlays.

Farmers Home Administration administers several important housing programs. This amendment would transfer lending authority from section 502 to section 515. Both programs are equally important to rural America. However, a cut in section 515 from $540 million in fiscal year 1994 to $30 million in fiscal year 1995 is not acceptable. This is a 94 percent reduction in funds.

Section 515 is the only housing program available for very-low-income families in rural America. The average tenant in a section 515 apartment earns less than $8,000. This is only 30 percent of the median rural household income. Section 502 provides homeownership opportunities to rural families with substantially higher incomes. We cannot abandon our commitment to providing housing for Americans of all incomes, especially when there is a shortage of 600,000 affordable rental units in rural areas today. This amendment offers a balanced housing program within FmHA.

Section 515 has led to the creation of 440,000 units throughout rural America. In fiscal year 1994, 14,000 new units will be produced. With the proposed fiscal year 1995, no new units will be produced. More importantly, the proposed $30 million budget will not provide sufficient funds to finance repairs to existing units.

Recent reports prepared by the Surveys and Investigation Staff of this Committee have disclosed many vulnerabilities in section 515. We share these concerns; and I have enrolled H.R. 4579 to correct these deficiencies. H.R. 4579 offers widesweeping reforms in section 515.

We are calling on you to support this amendment. Rather than not funding this worthwhile program, lets fix it, fund it and provide a balanced rural housing program.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. THOMPSON].

The amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: low-income section 502 loans, $282,640,000 of which $17,200,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans; section 504 housing repair loans, $11,690,000; section 514 farm labor housing, $7,911,000; and section 515 rental housing, $15,750,000.

□ 0950

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BEREUTER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BEREUTER: Page 43, after line 2, insert the following:

In addition, for the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974) of guaranteed loans under a demonstration program of loan guarantees for multifamily rental housing in rural areas, $1,000,000, be derived from the amount made available under this heading for the cost of low-income section 502 loans and to become available for obligation only upon the enactment of authorizing legislation.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member is offering an amendment which the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DURBIN, has graciously agreed to accept. The Bereuter amendment will transfer $1 million from the 502 Direct Loan Program and reserve it for funding a Rural Rental Housing Guarantee Program which the Banking Committee is in the process of authorizing. This 50 project demonstration program to provide Federal loan guarantees for the development of multifamily rental rural housing is included in H.R. 3838 which passed the Banking Committee on June 15, 1994. We would specify that the $1 million transfer would become available only upon the enactment of the authorizing legislation. This amendment has the approval of Chairman GONZALEZ of the Banking Committee, the Banking Committee's ranking member, Mr. LEACH, and the Housing Subcommittee's ranking member, Mrs. ROUKEMA.

The demonstration being funded would finance 25 projects in each of fiscal years 1995 and 1996 and would provide a 90 percent guarantee on loans made by private lenders to the developers of rental housing for five or more families.

Current law provides direct loans for the development of rental housing for low to moderate income families. The demonstration program will provide for additional housing for moderate income families at a limited cost to the Federal Government. Unlike direct loans, which require appropriations of the whole amount of a loan, loan guarantees only cost the Federal Government the amount of defaults on private loans.

This amendment will allow us to move forward to provide a cost effective new method for financing rural rental housing. This Member thanks Chairman DURBIN, the ranking member, Mr. SKEEN, and the leadership of the House Banking Committee for their cooperation in making this amendment possible.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman on the amendment. I think it is a good innovation and one that should be tried. I think it shows the flexibility that we have toward some of these programs and the way they operate. We commend the gentleman and accept the amendment.

Mr. BEREUTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, based upon the experience with the 502 home loan guarantee for single family, it is very cost effective with the default rate being less than 1.59 percent and going down.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois, chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman from Nebraska that I rise in support of his amendment.

I would like to acknowledge the important role the gentleman has played in establishing a program which I consider to be an unqualified success, that is, the 502 Guaranteed Unsubsidized Housing Program. This is a program which has demonstrated that through some creative thinking, we can bring together various agencies at the Federal level to provide families of modest incomes the opportunity for home ownership in rural areas. I have had three different seminars in my congressional district bringing together bankers, realtors, and developers to tell them about this program, and in each and every instance they were absolutely shocked to find out how simple this program was, how little paperwork was involved, and frankly they warmed up to using this program across my district and, as we see, across the Nation.

The gentleman from Nebraska deserves credit for this. He has worked long and hard on it. I think what he is suggesting today is an extension of that concept and one which I hope will be just as successful. I appreciate the fact that we are awaiting authorizing legislation and his assurance that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ], who also has supported this program very strongly, supports this amendment today. I rise in support of his effort.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his very kind words. I myself have had two such seminars lately in Norfolk and Lincoln, and frankly developers, lenders, home builders, and many other people involved cannot believe how simple it is to use the 502 Program.

We hope it will be a model for this program for rural rental housing multifamily.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $389,818,000.

RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For rental assistance agreements entered into or renewed pursuant to the authority under section 521(a)(2) or agreements entered into in lieu of forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $523,008,000; and in addition such sums as may be necessary, as authorized by section 521(c) of the Act, to liquidate debt incurred prior to fiscal year 1992 to carry out

the Rental Assistance Program under section 521(a)(2) of the Act: *Provided*, That of this amount not more than $5,900,000 shall be available for debt forgiveness or payments for eligible households as authorized by section 502(c)(5)(D) of the Act, and not to exceed $10,000 per project for advances to nonprofit organizations or public agencies to cover direct costs (other than purchase price) incurred in purchasing projects pursuant to section 502(c)(5)(C) of the Act: *Provided further*, That agreements entered into or renewed during fiscal year 1995 shall be funded for a five-year period, although the life of any such agreement may be extended to fully utilize amounts obligated.

SELF-HELP HOUSING LAND DEVELOPMENT FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized by section 523(b)(1)(B) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $603,000.

For the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, $11,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan program, $14,000.

AGRICULTURAL CREDIT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928–1929, to be available from funds in the Agricultural Credit Insurance Fund, as follows: farm ownership loans, $618,755,000, of which $540,674,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $2,465,000,000, of which $1,735,000,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $230,000,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; $4,312,000 for water development, use, and conservation loans, of which $1,415,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $1,000,000; and for emergency insured loans, $100,000,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: farm ownership loans, $31,853,000, of which $20,870,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; operating loans, $95,340,000, of which $9,360,000 shall be for unsubsidized guaranteed loans and $29,425,000 shall be for subsidized guaranteed loans; $411,000 for water development, use, and conservation loans, of which $31,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; Indian tribe land acquisition loans as authorized by 25 U.S.C. 488, $123,000; and for emergency insured loans, $26,060,000 to meet the needs resulting from natural disasters.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $243,766,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT INSURANCE FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct and guaranteed loans as authorized by 7 U.S.C. 1928 and 86 Stat. 661–664, as amended, to be available from funds in the Rural Development Insurance Fund, as follows: water and sewer facility loans, $834,193,000; community facility loans, $300,000,000, of which $75,000,000 shall be for guaranteed loans; and guaranteed industrial development loans, $500,000,000: *Provided*, That none of the funds made available in this Act may be used to make transfers between the above limitations: *Provided further*, That of the amounts appropriated above, $17,000,000 of direct water and sewer facility, $7,800,000 of direct community facility, and $11,000,000 of guaranteed industrial development loan funds shall be available through July 30, 1995, for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

For the cost of direct and guaranteed loans, including the cost of modifying loans, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as follows: direct water and sewer facility loans, $115,786,000; direct community facility loans, $21,723,000; guaranteed community facility loans, $3,728,000; and guaranteed industrial development loans, $4,750,000: *Provided*, That of the amounts appropriated in this paragraph, $2,360,000 for direct water and sewer facility loans, $753,000 for direct community facility, and $103,000 for guaranteed industrial development loans shall be available through July 30, 1995, for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $57,294,000.

RURAL DEVELOPMENT LOAN FUND PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans, $46,000,000, as authorized by the Rural Development Loan Fund (42 U.S.C. 9812(a)): *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans of $88,038,000: *Provided further*, That through July 30, 1995, of these amounts, $5,519,000 shall be available for the cost of direct loans, for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, $10,565,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct loan programs, $1,476,000.

STATE MEDIATION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 502(b) of the Agricultural Credit Act of 1987, as amended (7 U.S.C. 5101–5106), $2,000,000.

RURAL WATER AND WASTE DISPOSAL GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 306(a)(2) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926), $500,000,000, to remain available until expended, pursuant to section 306(d) of the above Act of which $19,047,000 shall be available, through July 30, 1995, for empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, and of which $25,000,000 shall be available for water and waste disposal systems to benefit the Colonias along the United States/Mexico border, including grants pursuant to section 306C: *Provided*, That, with the exception of the foregoing $19,047,000, and the foregoing $25,000,000, these funds shall not be used for any purpose not specified in section 306(a) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act.

VERY LOW-INCOME HOUSING REPAIR GRANTS

For grants to the very low-income elderly for essential repairs to dwellings pursuant to section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $24,900,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL HOUSING FOR DOMESTIC FARM LABOR

For financial assistance to eligible nonprofit organizations for housing for domestic farm labor, pursuant to section 516 of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1486), $10,900,000, to remain available until expended.

MUTUAL AND SELF-HELP HOUSING

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 523(b)(1)(A) of the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1490c), $12,650,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

SUPERVISORY AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For grants pursuant to sections 509(g)(6) and 525 of the Housing Act of 1949, $2,400,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL COMMUNITY FIRE PROTECTION GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 7 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (Public Law 95–313), $3,400,000 to fund up to 50 per centum of the cost of organizing, training, and equipping rural volunteer fire departments.

COMPENSATION FOR CONSTRUCTION DEFECTS

For compensation for construction defects as authorized by section 509(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, $495,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL HOUSING PRESERVATION GRANTS

For grants for rural housing preservation as authorized by section 552 of the Housing and Urban-Rural Recovery Act of 1983 (Public Law 98–181), $22,000,000.

RURAL BUSINESS ENTERPRISE GRANTS

For grants authorized under section 310B(c) and 310B(j) (7 U.S.C. 1932) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to any qualified public or private nonprofit organization, $47,500,000, of which $2,000,000 shall be to assist in developing cooperative efforts to provide information and technical assistance to under-represented groups in traditionally agricultural or other natural resource dependent communities for encouraging business development; and of which $9,500,000 shall be available through July 30, 1995, for assistance to empowerment zones and enterprise communities, as authorized by title XIII of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993: *Provided*, That $500,000 shall be available for grants to qualified nonprofit organizations to provide technical assistance and training for rural communities needing improved passenger transportation systems or facilities in order to promote economic development.

SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT GRANTS

For grants for pollution abatement and control projects authorized under section 310B(b) (7 U.S.C. 1932) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, $2,995,000: *Provided*, That such assistance shall include regional technical assistance for improvement of solid waste management.

OUTREACH FOR SOCIALLY DISADVANTAGED FARMERS

For grants and contracts pursuant to section 2501 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 (7 U.S.C. 2279), $2,995,000, to remain available until expended.

RURAL TECHNOLOGY AND COOPERATIVE DEVELOPMENT GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 310(f) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11)), $1,500,000.

LOCAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND PLANNING GRANTS

For grants pursuant to section 306(a)(11)(A) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1926(a)(11)), $2,500,000.

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Farmers Home Administration, not otherwise provided for, in administering the programs authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921–2000), as amended; title V of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1471–1490o); the Rural Rehabilitation Corporation Trust Liquidation Act, approved May 3, 1950 (40 U.S.C. 440–444), for administering the loan program authorized by title III–A of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–452 approved August 20, 1964), as amended; the Cooperative Marketing Act of July 2, 1926 (7 U.S.C. 451–457); and for activities relating to the marketing aspects of cooperatives, including economic research and analysis and the application of economic research findings, as authorized by the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1946 (7 U.S.C. 1621–1627), and for activities with institutions or organizations throughout the world concerning the development and operation of agricultural cooperatives (7 U.S.C. 3291), and such other programs which the Farmers Home Administration has the responsibility for administering, $700,585,000; of which $37,811,000 is hereby appropriated, $374,255,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Housing Insurance Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account, $229,735,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Agriculture Credit Insurance Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account, $57,294,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Development Insurance Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account, $1,476,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account, and $14,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Self-Help Housing Land Development Fund Program Account in this Act and merged with this account: *Provided*, That not to exceed $515,000 of this appropriation may be used for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $4,159,000 of this appropriation shall be available for contracting with the National Rural Water Association or other equally qualified national organization for a circuit rider program to provide technical assistance for rural water systems: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $2,000,000 shall be available through cooperative agreements to assist in developing efforts to provide information and technical assistance to traditionally under-represented communities to encourage business community development.

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

To carry into effect the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901–950(b)), as follows:

RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND TELEPHONE LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

Insured loans pursuant to the authority of section 305 of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), shall be made as follows: 5 percent rural electrification loans, $100,000,000; 5 percent rural telephone loans, $75,000,000; cost of money rural telephone loans, $198,000,000; municipal rate rural electric loans, $575,250,000; and loans made pursuant to section 306 of that Act, $420,000,000, to remain available until expended.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct and guaranteed loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), as follows: cost of direct loans, $19,120,000; cost of municipal rate loans, $46,020,000; cost of money rural telephone loans, $40,000; cost of loans guaranteed pursuant to section 306, $450,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, $29,982,000.

RURAL TELEPHONE BANK PROGRAM ACCOUNT

The Rural Telephone Bank is hereby authorized to make such expenditures, within the limits of funds available to such corporation in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended, as may be necessary in carrying out its authorized programs for the current fiscal year. During fiscal year 1995 and within the resources and authority available, gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans shall be $175,000,000.

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, including the cost of modifying loans, of direct loans authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 935), $2,728,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses necessary to carry out the loan programs, $8,794,000.

DISTANCE LEARNING AND MEDICAL LINK PROGRAMS

For necessary expenses to carry into effect the programs authorized in sections 2331–2335 of Public Law 101–624, $7,500,000, to remain available until expended.

REA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, as authorized under section 313 of the Rural Electrification Act, for the purpose of promoting rural economic development and job creation projects, $12,865,000.

For the cost of direct loans, including the cost of modifying loans as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, $3,077,000.

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out the provisions of the Rural Electrification Act of 1936, as amended (7 U.S.C. 901–950(b)), and to administer the loan and loan guarantee programs for Community Antenna Television facilities as authorized by the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921–1995), and for which commitments were made prior to fiscal year 1994, including not to exceed $7,000 for financial and credit reports, funds for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $103,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109, $38,776,000; of which $29,982,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account in this Act and $8,794,000 shall be derived by transfer from the Rural Telephone Bank Program Account in this Act: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act may be used to authorize the transfer of additional funds to this account from the Rural Telephone Bank.

Mr. DURBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the balance of title III be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to the balance of title III?

If not, are there any amendments to the balance of title III?

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to be here earlier but was unavoidably detained.

Mr. Chairman, it had been my intention to offer amendments to restore at least half of the funding cut from the Food Safety Inspection Service. But after consulting with legislative counsel and Appropriations Committee staff, it was evident that an attempt at en bloc amendments at this point would not succeed, and an attempt to simply add the money—albeit with amendments to cut to follow—would be ruled out of order, because the addition of funding would push the bill's outlays over the 602(b) allocations.

This is an extremely frustrating situation. Here we have a bill that unnecessarily harms production agriculture, and those of us who would like to try to do something about it, have our hands tied behind our backs.

This bill reduces FSIS funding $85 million from the fiscal year 1994 funding level. The cut actually translates into a $103 million shortfall, because that is the amount needed to retain services at the current level in fiscal year 1995. This is a 16.6 percent reduction, and it is not fair.

By cutting FSIS, the beef cattle industry, which is already experiencing the lowest prices they have had in 10 years, will most likely take a deep nose dive.

I have been getting calls and letters into my office by cattle growers all over Nebraska, that are being hit hard by the latest downward trend in cattle prices.

On top of this, in this era of Government efficiency, this bill now tells producers they must pay a user fee, and if they're lucky, they will get their cattle into the slaughterhouse, because USDA will only have enough money to pay inspectors for one shift per day.

This should not be the news Congress should be giving producers.

I sat down with my staff and a calculator, and we quickly found a way to restore nearly half the cuts in FSIS, by reducing the increases—I repeat increases—in a number of programs and redirecting those dollars to FSIS.

For example, giving the Rural Rental Assistance Program a 10-percent increase instead of a 17-percent increase,

frees up more than $31 million for meat inspection.

FDA buildings and facilities got a 117 percent increase, an increase that was not requested by the administration. A mere 50 percent increase would have freed up $4 million for more meat inspection services.

For FDA's salaries and expenses account, H.R. 4554 calls for 2.66 percent increase. By only increasing FDA's salaries by 2 percent, there is an additional $5 million that can go to the FSIS.

The irony in this example is that the FSIS and the FDA both have a common purpose—consumer protection. Yet, while the FDA is slated for increased funding, this bill guts the FSIS' mission.

It is my understanding that a motion to recommit will be offered by Mr. DELAY. I have encouraged him to include instructions in his motion, for restoring FSIS funding, and I urge my colleagues to support the people who put the meat on the table, and support this recommit with instructions.

This is supposed to be an agriculture appropriations bill. Let's make it so.

□ 1000

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

Mr. Chairman, I might say to my colleague and friend from Nebraska that I concur with many of the points that he has made, and I understand the travails that are facing the beef and cattle industry at this moment.

But this subcommittee really had its hands full. We had to cut, make drastic cuts, from last year's appropriations bill. We have assumed a recommendation made under the Reagan administration, the Bush administration, and the Clinton administration that a user fee be enacted that would cover second- and third-shift inspections at meat and poultry facilities. The Federal taxpayers would still assume the responsibility for first-shift inspections, but second and third shifts would be covered by a user fee paid by the industry.

I wish this were not the case. I wish we did not have to request this. Unfortunately, if we are really going to reduce this deficit, if we are going to bring down spending, we are going to face choices like this every day on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Let me quickly add that our subcommittee does not have authority to impose this user fee. We have turned to the committee of jurisdiction, the Committee on Agriculture, to ask them to tackle this very difficult problem.

Your friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], was on the floor earlier addressing this issue in a colloquy. He made a point which I agreed with, that we should work with the Department of Agriculture in the next few months to do our best to come up with the fairest way to reform the current system and to try to reduce any burden there might be on the processors and those that use this inspection service. I think he is on the right track.

What we really need is a revolution in thinking about meat and poultry inspection. In my callow youth, I spent 12 months working in a slaughterhouse in East St. Louis, IL, working my way through college. The Federal meat inspectors were at that time men, all men, wearing white smocks, white helmets, who stood and watched as the carcasses went down the line. If they saw anything that looked unusual or smelled bad, they stopped it. That was it. That was a pretty good system when you consider the rest of the world.

Today our consumers are demanding more. They are asking for more confidence in the products that go through this inspection process. We have a responsibility to meet those demands. I have given those responsibilities, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] and I have, to the Committee on Agriculture. It is a tough job. We will work with them.

But I think when it is all done, we are going to have a modern system of meat and poultry inspection to the credit of ranchers and cattlemen and pork producers and those in the poultry industry across the United States. It's a tough job, and I think the gentleman has acknowledged how tough it will be, but I think it is one we can be proud of that we are facing this responsibility in trying to address it.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks, the explanation.

I continue, however, to have my own serious concerns about not only the cattle industry but further reductions in agriculture appropriations.

Mr. DURBIN. Let me just say this to the gentleman: We cannot continue to call for deficit reduction, spending cuts, program reductions, and be surprised or shocked that we come out with appropriation bills like this.

We have to understand that all of the speeches we have made about deficit reduction eventually are going to result in appropriation bills that cut very important programs. I will say to the gentleman that, as we give our speeches about deficit reduction and balanced budgets and A to Z and line-item vetoes, let us cut more, we have got to reduce the deficit, ultimately we have to pay the piper. This is what this bill is faced with.

So many farm groups came to me last year when the Clinton deficit reduction plan was on the table, and said we need to cut more spending, Clinton does not cut enough spending. I, frankly, think the President did. I voted for it. I know the gentleman did not. But if we had cut more spending then in deficit reduction, this bill would be even worse today.

When we vote on the floor of the House to exempt the Veterans' Administration from any cuts in their budget, we put more burden on valuable farm programs. What I am suggesting to the gentleman is we have got to look beyond the big picture to the specific appropriation bills.

The gentleman from New Mexico and I had the unenviable task of wrestling with deficit reduction policy in its extreme.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN].

Mr. SKEEN. I want to respond to the gentleman from Nebraska.

You have made an excellent point. As a cattle grower myself, we are always sensitive to any change in the processing or whatever that has a reflection on the price of beef. But, of course, the price of beef has gone down even without the system being imposed.

It always bothers me about where are the variables in those markets. And we do not want the processors to have to assume more of a burden, because that is passed on to the consumer and not the producer.

So it is a very ticklish situation, and it is one that takes a lot of introspection, a lot of deep thinking, and a lot of understanding, and I think together, I appreciate the representations you have made for those growers.

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

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word. I will not take the 5 minutes, but this is an opportunity to say to the people of this country we ought to know more about the whole process rather than taking it for granted as we have in the past.

Because there are a lot of people who are leaving the production area because there is just absolutely no way you can make a good living out of that. We do not want to exacerbate that by what we do in the Congress of the United States.

So we do these things with a lot of concern and a lot of care. We appreciate your concern and your expression.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the remainder of title III?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BURTON OF INDIANA

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BURTON of Indiana: Page 51, strike lines 1 through 5.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago, a new program was started. It was an outreach program for socially disadvantaged farmers and

ranchers, and we put $1 million into that program. I objected to it at that time because nobody in this Chamber could give me a definition of what a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher was, and then somebody, and I think it was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DE LA GARZA], came down and said, well, it is people who have been discriminated against because of ethnicity, their ethnic background, because of their social background and so forth.

Then we involved ourselves in a colloquy. We found that under the civil rights laws we have right now anybody who is discriminated against for those reasons can go to court, and there are criminal penalties. So we really do not need it for that purpose.

So today we have not $1 million in here. It was raised to $3 million last year. This year it is $3 million again.

I noticed the chairman and ranking Republican on this committee cut $5,000 out of it. I appreciate that. But it is still really $3 million, three times what it was just 2 years ago.

The fact of the matter is we do not need this program. Nobody knows what a socially disadvantaged farmer is. As a matter of fact, the money, the largest part of it, went to 21 different universities and colleges around the country to implement the program. It looks like to me it is a pork-barrel project for 21 or 22 universities, because the money is not getting to the farmers in the first place.

We have extension programs to help farmers with problems they have like filling out forms or understanding what kind of herbicides or pesticides to use or anything that has to do with farming. Yet here is a program nobody knows what it is for, nobody knows who it is supposed to help, they cannot explain it on the floor of the House, and we are spending $3 million for it.

So I would say to my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska, and my colleague, the gentleman from New Mexico, we are talking about this bill being cut because of other programs, other appropriations bills not being cut, and this bill has been cut unfairly. Here is $3 million we can take out that nobody is going to miss, because it is not helping anybody except 21 universities, and nobody knows what they are doing with the money.

If you look at the definition on page 1, it says, and here is what this money is used for, one-on-one assistance in filling out the forms required for participating in agricultural programs. Your extension programs do that. There will be special training courses and meetings to explain the provisions of these programs. They do that as well. Both individual and group training and assistance will be provided on such matters as land preparation, planting, seed selection, harvesting, and marketing. They do that as well. Sources of financial assistance including Farmers Home Administration's own lending program will be identified. They do that as well.

So what is the purpose of this program? If it is to make sure there is no discrimination based upon people's ethnic background or social background, that is already in the law under the civil rights law.

We have got the Farmers Home Administration; we have got the extension programs. What do we need to be spending this $3 million on this program for? It makes absolutely no sense, and if somebody can explain to me in some detail what a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher is, I would love to hear it, because I have been waiting for 3 years, and I still do not have an answer.

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

Mr. Chairman, I stand in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

If I might, I would like to explain a little bit about this program. The gentleman understands that the Extension Service has a responsibility nationwide to help many individuals including farmers, ranchers, and other producers to deal with some of the challenges they face in farming and ranching.

The Extension Service does an excellent job. I have been surprised that their reach goes far beyond the farm and rural areas. In fact, it is even felt in many cities around the country.

What was done in the last farm bill was to try to separate a small part of the Extension Service budget and to focus on those farmers and producers who are socially disadvantaged, as the bill characterizes them.

□ 1010

We are talking about African-Americans, American Indians, Hispanic-Americans and they comprise about 3 percent of our farm population nationwide. The money which is given to the 21 colleges and universities under this act is used to establish programs of outreach to help these minority and socially disadvantaged farmers and ranchers deal with the challenges that they face today in farming. It is a specialized program, I will concede, but it is not unique. The services the Extension Service offers nationwide really parallel what is being offered through this program. We are trying to focus though on colleges and universities which serve a special constituency.

I think the gentleman, if he will review the colleges which receive the money, will find among them many rural colleges and those that are historically black colleges, and cooperatives in the areas where American Indians can be found, which really try to focus on minority needs. I might say to the gentleman that some 81 different institutions applied for moneys under this program for this purpose. The 21 that are enumerated; I am sure the gentleman has seen this list, were the winners in that competition.

I do not think it is unreasonable for us to do this. The Extension Service has a valuable job, an important job. What we are trying to do with a small sliver of funding is to focus on what we consider to be a special problem.

I have dealt with the Committee on Agriculture, which, of course, has created the authorizing language for this program, and I frankly hope that the gentleman will reconsider his position, and I rise in opposition to his amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's disconcertion over whether or not what is a socially disadvantaged farmer or rancher. Already we have discussed this morning about our economic disadvantageous situations, and most farmers or agriculturalists are in that position to begin with, but coming from a State like the State of New Mexico where we have a tricultural background, 48 percent of my district is Hispanic, also we have the native Americans and one who has worked in the field with Extension Service and some of the rest, there are just a lot of cracks in this thing that cannot be spanned by any existing programs other than the socially disadvantaged program that we put the $3 million in, and we took $5,000 out of it, I know.

But this is a program that has a place. It can be used because there is not available to some of these people the regular Extension Service from the land grant colleges. There is an absolute and essential need. There is no question about that. If the gentleman is not convinced, then I invite him to come take a look at the way the program is operating in my State and some of the other States that have these cultural, large cultural, groups that are agriculturally based primarily, and to see how it works, because the money has been well used and has not been wasted, and I think it is a program that we should continue until there is no such thing, or even a need, to define what is socially disadvantageous or economically disadvantageous just insofar as agriculture is concerned.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to tell my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], that some of the people who benefit from his program are the people who live on the Navajo Nation. We have some of these moneys going to the Navajo Community College and also Crown Point Community College.

As my colleagues know, the land that they have sometimes does not produce

most effectively, and also we want to make sure that the land they do have, that they take care of it and make sure that we do not have soil erosion, et cetera, use the water, proper planning.

So, in my particular area, and also with the area that the ranking member represents, this area, or these moneys, help the Navajo Nation to produce more effectively.

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

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, this is a time of severe fiscal and budgetary problems for this Nation. There is just no question about it. Everybody knows that. Even the President has talked about that. The deficit has been out of control. The national debt is about $4.5 to $5 trillion, and we should be economizing everywhere we can.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] has said that this is a parallel program. It is a duplicate program. Parallel, duplicate; it is the same thing. The fact of the matter is that we are spending $3 million for a program that is already being provided by the farmers extension programs, by the Agriculture Department and anybody who feels like they are being discriminated against already has protection under the civil rights laws. There is just no reason for this.

Now, when we look at the universities that are getting this money: Arkansas Land and Farm Development, the Association for Community Based Education, Salinas, CA, University of Vermont in Burlington, VT, Lincoln University in Missouri, Jefferson City, MO, Southern University A&M College, Baton Rouge, LA, Florida A&M University in Tallahassee, Tuskegee University, Tuskegee, AL, University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff, AR, we do not need this program. It is a duplication. It is $3 million that is really a waste of taxpayers' money. Nobody really has given us a true definition of what a socially disadvantaged farmer is. If a farmer has a problem and needs additional education, needs help in filling out forms, as is alleged in this bill that this is supposed to help, they can get it already. We do not need to spend this $3 million, and, if we have the fiscal problems that we all know we already have, then here is a way to save $3 million of taxpayers' money, and it can be used on another, possibly better, program for the farmers.

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Chairman, the Minority Farm Outreach Program funded under section 2501(a) of the 1990 FACT Act is a serious, critical and long overdue effort to redress the years of discrimination faced by minority producers in this Nation. Mr. BURTON last year, during his attempt to delete these funds, repeated a question posed to him of whether a socially disadvantaged farmer is one who cannot get a date to a barn dance. This statement mocks the seriousness of a situation which should cause us great shame.

The Socially Disadvantaged Farmer/Rancher Program is extremely cost effective because it provides the assistance directly to the organizations who can work directly with these farmers to keep them on the land. In 1975 there were only 175 African-American farmers under the age of 25 in the entire Nation. Lets bring our young people back to the land, and develop diversification and marketing plans essential to the future of minority farm agriculture. We need this program for our farmers.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Chairman, I rise outraged at this amendment and ask for all my colleagues in the House to oppose this amendment. This program was authorized under the farm bill under the leadership of the current Secretary of Agriculture at $10 million per year. The subcommittee has cut the program below the President's request and below last year's level. There is a longstanding history of discrimination at USDA and this program provides technical assistance to members of our society which have been discriminated against over the years.

Let us look at the facts. In 1920, 900,000 black farmers owned over 15 million acres of land. That is almost 1 million black farmers. By 1960, that number had dropped to 100,000 black farmers with less than 6 million acres. By 1980, only 57,000 blacks owned less than 4 million acres. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, in 1987, the U.S. Agricultural census could only document 25,000 black farmers owning less than 2.5 million acres. So where have we come. From 900,000 farmers to 25,000. That my colleagues is shameful and unacceptable.

We must first admit there have been longstanding problems regarding USDA's treatment of the black farmer. The 1982 U.S. Civil Rights Commission Report stated that without comprehensive action, no black farmers will remain by the year 2000.

This is an essential program which demands our support. I resent the gentleman from Indiana offering this amendment and would like to give him the opportunity to withdraw the amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 264, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 254]

AYES—139

Allard
Archer
Armey
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barca
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentley
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Condit
Cox
Crapo
DeLay
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Emerson
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fingerhut
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goss
Grandy
Greenwood
Hall (TX)
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hefley
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Houghton
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Linder
Manzullo
McCollum
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Myers
Nussle
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Ramstad
Ravenel
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Santorum
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Sensenbrenner
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Torricelli
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Wolf
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOES—264

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Beilenson
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Callahan
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
de Lugo (VI)
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilman
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodling
Gordon
Green
Gunderson
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hastings
Hefner
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Hoyer
Hughes
Hutto
Inslee
Jacobs
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kingston
Kleczka
Klein
Klink
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Lucas
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan

Meek	Rangel	Sundquist
Menendez	Reed	Swett
Mfume	Regula	Swift
Mineta	Richardson	Synar
Minge	Roberts	Tanner
Mink	Roemer	Tauzin
Moakley	Rose	Tejeda
Mollohan	Rostenkowski	Thompson
Montgomery	Rowland	Thornton
Morella	Roybal-Allard	Thurman
Murphy	Sabo	Torres
Murtha	Sanders	Towns
Nadler	Sangmeister	Traficant
Neal (MA)	Sarpalius	Underwood (GU)
Norton (DC)	Sawyer	Unsoeld
Oberstar	Schiff	Valentine
Obey	Schroeder	Velazquez
Olver	Schumer	Vento
Ortiz	Scott	Visclosky
Owens	Serrano	Volkmer
Pallone	Sharp	Walsh
Parker	Shepherd	Waters
Pastor	Sisisky	Watt
Payne (NJ)	Skaggs	Waxman
Payne (VA)	Skeen	Wheat
Pelosi	Skelton	Whitten
Penny	Smith (IA)	Williams
Peterson (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Peterson (MN)	Smith (TX)	Wise
Pickett	Spratt	Woolsey
Pickle	Stark	Wyden
Pomeroy	Stenholm	Wynn
Poshard	Stokes	Yates
Price (NC)	Strickland	Young (AK)
Quillen	Studds	
Rahall	Stupak	

NOT VOTING—36

Andrews (ME)	Hayes	Quinn
Boehlert	Hilliard	Reynolds
Brooks	Laughlin	Ridge
Brown (CA)	Lipinski	Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Clay	Livingston	Rush
Collins (IL)	Machtley	Slattery
Crane	McCurdy	Smith (OR)
Derrick	McMillan	Talent
Faleomavaega (AS)	Michel	Tucker
Flake	Miller (CA)	Washington
Gallo	Moran	Weldon
Grams	Neal (NC)	
	Pryce (OH)	

□ 1040

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Grams for, with Mrs. Collins of Illinois against.

Mr. Quinn for, with Mr. Tucker against.

Messrs. McCANDLESS, CUNNINGHAM, and FOGLIETTA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. CAMP, TAYLOR of Mississippi, SAXTON, HALL of Texas, EWING, BARCA of Wisconsin, and HOBSON changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to the remainder of title III?

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to, among other things, congratulate the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] for the tremendous job they have done in a very, very difficult budgetary environment.

Having congratulated the chairman and the ranking member, I want to say that I was particularly troubled, though, by some of the debate that took place last night as part of general debate on this agricultural appropriations bill and some of the information that has been disseminated in "Dear Colleague" letters that urge a no vote on this bill, because, in fact, it cuts agricultural programs too deeply.

It seems to me that it is rank hypocrisy to advocate spending cuts, specific spending cuts in the agricultural area, and then urge Members to vote no because this bill cuts spending.

In fact, many of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have voted for spending cuts that are far deeper than those that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] have been required to bring to the floor on this bill.

I wanted to point out that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], the Republican ranking member on the Committee on the Budget, has deservedly won plaudits for his very specific budget resolution; the fact that when it was submitted to the House, it contained detailed spending cuts. And so for the first time in many years, we are really able to trace Republican spending priorities on agricultural issues.

The proposal of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], which was defeated but supported by an overwhelming number of Republicans, gives us a blueprint as to Republican priorities in the agricultural spending area.

Only nine Republicans opposed the proposal of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH]. In fact, of the 158 who supported it in a losing cause, an overwhelming number of agricultural district Republicans supported it.

I have looked through the voting records. I note that in Colorado, in Georgia, in Indiana, in Iowa, and in Kansas, in fact, Republicans unanimously supported the Kasich budget as it relates to agriculture.

But let me tell Members what that does. It specifically cuts $8.9 billion over 5 years. And this, of course, is in discretionary spending, in most cases the same kind of spending cuts that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] have been dealing with in this bill. Much deeper cuts were recommended and supported by the Republicans in the Kasich budget.

Let me read into the RECORD just what they have proposed we do before they come to the floor and urge we defeat this bill.

They have proposed that we reduce the Farmers Home Administration farm loan program by $423 million, cut over 5 years. They have proposed a reduction in the Agricultural Research Service of $830 million cut over 5 years. They have proposed a reduction in the Agricultural Extension Service of $505 million cut over 5 years. They have proposed to cut $889 million in farm agency field offices over 5 years. They have proposed to restructure the nonfarm service agencies within the Department to the tune of a $535 million cut over 5 years.

They went after the Foreign Agricultural Trade Service, cut it $33 million over 5 years; proposed a reduction in the funding for the Cooperative States Research Service to the tune of $331 million cut over 5 years.

They proposed a reduction in a number of programs that are really in tune with rural development, including water and sewer program and propose to cut the WIC Program by $882 million cut over 5 years.

The Department of Agriculture's overhead was supposed to take a $3.4 billion reduction over 5 years. This sort of program reduction, of course, is felt by people on the farm.

And a reduction in loan guarantees under the USDA Export Credit Commodity Program, the Commodity Credit Corporation, a $1.1 billion cut over 5 years. And of course, just for good public relations, they threw in the honey program for $3 million, quite in contrast to the billions and hundreds of millions that are cut in programs that really do serve the needs of agriculture in its most basic sense.

So I am here today to say that I think this committee has done an excellent job. The net reduction in discretionary spending is forced by the need to reduce the overall deficit of this country. And for Republicans to urge a no vote on this bill, after savaging agricultural programs in their budget, is rank hypocrisy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE IV—DOMESTIC FOOD PROGRAMS

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR FOOD AND CONSUMER SERVICES

For necessary salaries and expenses of the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Food and Consumer Services to administer the laws enacted by the Congress for the Food and Nutrition Service, $540,000.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751–1769b), and the applicable provisions other than sections 3 and 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1773–1785, and 1788–1789); $7,451,351,000, to remain available through September 30, 1996, of which $2,202,274,000 is hereby appropriated and $5,249,077,000 shall be derived by transfer from funds available under section 32 of the Act of August 24, 1935 (7 U.S.C. 612c): *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the purpose of section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 shall be allocated among the States but the distribution of such funds to an individual State is contingent upon that State's agreement to participate in studies and surveys of programs authorized under the National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, when such studies and surveys have been directed by the Congress and requested by the Secretary of Agriculture: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary of Agriculture determines

that a State's administration of any program under the National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (other than section 17), or the regulations issued pursuant to these Acts, is seriously deficient, and the State fails to correct the deficiency within a specified period of time, the Secretary may withhold from the State some or all of the funds allocated to the State under section 7 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and under section 13(k)(1) of the National School Lunch Act; upon a subsequent determination by the Secretary that the programs are operated in an acceptable manner some or all of the funds withheld may be allocated: *Provided further*, That only final reimbursement claims for service of meals, supplements, and milk submitted to State agencies by eligible schools, summer camps, institutions, and service institutions within sixty days following the month for which the reimbursement is claimed shall be eligible for reimbursement from funds appropriated under this Act. States may receive program funds appropriated under this Act for meals, supplements, and milk served during any month only if the final program operations report for such month is submitted to the Department within ninety days following that month. Exceptions to these claims or reports submission requirements may be made at the discretion of the Secretary: *Provided further*, That up to $3,849,000 shall be available for independent verification of school food service claims: *Provided further*, That $1,706,000 shall be available to provide financial and other assistance to operate the Food Service Management Institute.

SPECIAL MILK PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the special milk program, as authorized by section 3 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1772), $18,089,000, to remain available through September 30, 1996. Only final reimbursement claims for milk submitted to State agencies within sixty days following the month for which the reimbursement is claimed shall be eligible for reimbursement from funds appropriated under this Act. States may receive program funds appropriated under this Act only if the final program operations report for such month is submitted to the Department within ninety days following that month. Exceptions to these claims or reports submission requirements may be made at the discretion of the Secretary.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS, AND CHILDREN (WIC)

For necessary expenses to carry out the special supplemental food program as authorized by section 17 of the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1786), $3,470,000,000, to remain available through September 30, 1996, of which up to $5,500,000 may be used to carry out the farmer's market coupon program: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay administrative expenses of WIC clinics except those that have an announced policy of prohibiting smoking within the space used to carry out the program: *Provided further*, That no State will incur an interest liability to the Federal Government on WIC rebate funds provided that all interest earned by the State on these funds is used for program purposes.

COMMODITY SUPPLEMENTAL FOOD PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the commodity supplemental food program as authorized by section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)), including not less than $8,000,000 for the projects in Detroit, New Orleans, and Des Moines, $94,500,000, to remain available through September 30, 1996: *Provided*, That none of these funds shall be available to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for commodities donated to the program.

FOOD STAMP PROGRAM

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2011-2029), $28,817,457,000: *Provided*, That funds provided herein shall remain available through September 30, 1995, in accordance with section 18(a) of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That $2,500,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be placed in reserve for use only in such amounts and at such times as may become necessary to carry out program operations: *Provided further*, That funds provided herein shall be expended in accordance with section 16 of the Food Stamp Act: *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be subject to any work registration or work fare requirements as may be required by law: *Provided further*, That $1,143,000,000 of the foregoing amount shall be available for Nutrition Assistance for Puerto Rico as authorized by U.S.C. 2028, of which $12,472,000 shall be transferred to the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service for the Cattle Tick Eradication Project: *Provided further*, That no funds provided herein shall be available to provide food assistance in cash in any county not covered by a demonstration project that received final approval from the Secretary on or before July 1, 1994.

FOOD DONATIONS PROGRAMS FOR SELECTED GROUPS

For necessary expenses to carry out section 4(a) of the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973 (7 U.S.C. 612c (note)), section 4(b) of the Food Stamp Act (7 U.S.C. 2013(b)), and section 311 of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended (42 U.S.C. 3030a), $183,154,000, to remain available through September 30, 1996.

For necessary expenses to carry out section 110 of the Hunger Prevention Act of 1988, $40,000,000.

THE EMERGENCY FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, $40,000,000: *Provided*, That in accordance with section 202 of Public Law 98-92, these funds shall be available only if the Secretary determines the existence of excess commodities.

For purchases of commodities to carry out the Emergency Food Assistance Act of 1983, as amended, $40,000,000.

FOOD PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For necessary administrative expenses of the domestic food programs funded under this Act, $106,465,000; of which $5,000,000 shall be available only for simplifying procedures, reducing overhead costs, tightening regulations, improving food stamp coupon handling, and assistance in the prevention, identification, and prosecution of fraud and other violations of law; *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available for employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), and not to exceed $150,000 shall be available for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109.

Mr. DURBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title IV be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1050

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order or amendments thereto?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—FOREIGN ASSISTANCE AND RELATED PROGRAMS

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, including carrying out title VI of the Agricultural Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1761-1768), market development activities abroad, and for enabling the Secretary to coordinate and integrate activities of the Department in connection with foreign agricultural work, including not to exceed $128,000 for representation allowances and for expenses pursuant to section 8 of the Act approved August 3, 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1766), $118,011,000, of which $4,914,000 may be transferred from Commodity Credit Corporation funds, $2,792,000 may be transferred from the Commodity Credit Corporation Program Account in this Act, and $1,425,000 may be transferred from the Public Law 480 Program Account in this Act: *Provided*, That in addition, funds available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available to assist an international organization in meeting the costs, including salaries, fringe benefits and other associated costs, related to the employment by the organization of Federal personnel that may transfer to the organization under the provisions of 5 U.S.C. 3581-3584, or of other well-qualified United States citizens, for the performance of activities that contribute to increased understanding of international agricultural issues, with transfer of funds for this purpose from one appropriation to another or to a single account authorized, such funds remaining available until expended: *Provided further*, That the Service may utilize advances of funds, or reimburse this appropriation for expenditures made on behalf of Federal agencies, public and private organizations and institutions under agreements executed pursuant to the agricultural food production assistance programs (7 U.S.C. 1736) and the foreign assistance programs of the International Development Cooperation Administration (22 U.S.C. 2392).

None of the funds in the foregoing paragraph shall be available to promote the sale or export of tobacco or tobacco products.

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

Mr. Chairman, I repeatedly hear on this floor talk about how cuts on the discretionary agriculture budget are to reduce the deficit. I would like to have the leadership on the other side, who orchestrates this, tell us about the cuts in the President's program before. How many times has the gentleman cut the operating budget of agriculture? He knows he has done it repeatedly, and at the same time, he increases the spending on the social side of the agriculture budget.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman, please quit putting out that word that only discretionary spending is being cut for the deficit. Of

course it is, but the gentleman is putting it back in spending on the nondiscretionary side.

Mr. DURBIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EWING. I certainly will.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to concede to the gentleman that there are increases in this bill. They are very limited. Of the 90 some different programs that we have jurisdiction over in this appropriation bill, a handful received increases. Our committee report enumerates most of those increases.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EWING] believes, as I do, that the WIC program, which now serves 40 percent of the infants in America, is a critical investment in the future, not only of urban America, but also of rural America.

Mr. Chairman, we have provided $90 million less than the President asked for, but we are on the track toward full funding for WIC. The gentleman represents a rural area, as I do, and he knows that there are many senior citizens and poor families in rural areas that need public housing. We provide some $76 million in rental assistance to help those senior citizens, and to help those poor families find housing.

Mr. EWING. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, let me say that that is probably very true, but the gentleman is increasing WIC. He did not cut WIC.

Mr. DURBIN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, that is true.

Mr. EWING. The gentleman is cutting the production programs that provide the cheap food policy of this country and assist every family, poor and rich, in this country, and particularly the poor.

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

Mr. EWING. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, I serve on the Committee on Agriculture, and I would have to say that the Republicans on the committee were willing to look at the need to reduce deficit spending. Those of us who represent agricultural districts were willing to make our shared sacrifice in reaching that goal.

However, what is happening with this appropriation bill, and generally what is happening in the Department of Agriculture, is that 60 percent of the Department of Agriculture is going into nutrition programs, and only about 20 percent is actually going to production agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, the bottom line is that we are taking away from those who are working and trying to produce and feed this country, in fact, feed the world, and giving to those who are becoming more reliant on the Government and not actually producing people.

When we look at the continued burden we are putting on the farmer in the way of rules and regulations, we are making it more difficult for him to do business. We are increasing his taxes. In addition, Mr. Chairman, we are knocking him out in the agricultural department and not giving him the support that he really needs.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, very simply, no one can dispute this, except maybe the figures, and I do not have them here in front of me, but we know we cut the agriculture budget about $4 billion for the President's deficit reduction program in production agriculture, and we know that we have cut it repeatedly, and that it has been going down every year.

The farmers in my district, the agricultural producers in my district, want to take their share of the deficit reduction. They just cannot take it all. Neither can defense. That is exactly what the gentleman is doing on that side of the aisle, cutting defense and cutting agriculture, and putting it into social spending. Let me tell the gentleman, the American people it is not lost on. They know what is happening.

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

Mr. EWING. I certainly will.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I just need to know, does the gentleman support full funding of the WIC program?

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that I support funding of the WIC program at its level of last year. Any increases over that should not be done at the expense of production agriculture.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. EWING. Mr. Chairman, if the President wants funding, he can allocate more money to that without the gentleman taking it from discretionary funding of the agriculture budget.

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

Mr. EWING. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman remember voting for the Kasich budget?

Mr. EWING. I did, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman realize that the cut over 5 years was $8.9 billion, and much of that out of discretionary spending on agriculture?

Mr. EWING. I do, Mr. Chairman, and I do that because, as I said before, I am willing and the people in my district are willing to take their share of the cut for deficit reduction.

The Kasich budget cut many other things.

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title V be considered as read, be printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of title V is as follows:

SCIENTIFIC ACTIVITIES OVERSEAS (FOREIGN CURRENCY PROGRAM)

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

For payments in foreign currencies owed to or owned by the United States for research activities authorized by section 104(c)(7) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704(c)(7)), not to exceed $1,062,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed $25,000 of these funds shall be available for payments in foreign currencies for expenses of employment pursuant to the second sentence of section 706(a) of the Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2225), as amended by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

PUBLIC LAW 480 PROGRAM ACCOUNTS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For expenses during the current fiscal year, not otherwise recoverable, and unrecovered prior years' costs, including interest thereon, under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1691, 1701–1715, 1721–1726, 1727–1727f, 1731–1736g), as follows: (1) $291,342,000 for Public Law 480 title I credit, including Food for Progress programs; (2) $29,000,000 is hereby appropriated for ocean freight differential costs for the shipment of agricultural commodities pursuant to title I of said Act and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended; (3) $821,100,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title II of said Act; and (4) $157,442,000 is hereby appropriated for commodities supplied in connection with dispositions abroad pursuant to title II of said Act: *Provided*, That not to exceed 15 per centum of the funds made available to carry out any title of said Act may be used to carry out any other title of said Act: *Provided further*, That such sums shall remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b).

For the cost, as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, of direct credit agreements as authorized by the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, including the cost of modifying credit agreements under said Act, $236,162,000.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the Public Law 480 title I credit program, and the Food for Progress Act of 1985, as amended, to the extent funds appropriated for Public Law 480 are utilized, $2,461,000.

SHORT-TERM EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than $5,000,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export credit guarantee program for short-term credit extended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof, as authorized by section 211(b)(1) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641).

INTERMEDIATE EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than $500,000,000 in credit guarantees under its export guarantee program for intermediate-term credit extended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof, as authorized by section

211(b)(2) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978 (7 U.S.C. 5641).

EMERGING DEMOCRACIES EXPORT CREDIT

The Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available not less than $500,000,000 in credit guarantees under its Export Guarantee Program for credit expended to finance the export sales of United States agricultural commodities and the products thereof to emerging democracies, as authorized by section 1542 of Public Law 101-624 (7 U.S.C. 5622 note).

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION EXPORT LOANS PROGRAM ACCOUNT

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For administrative expenses to carry out CCC's Export Guarantee Program, GSM 102 and GSM 103, $3,381,000; to cover common overhead expenses as permitted by section 11 of the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and in conformity with the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990, of which not to exceed $2,792,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Foreign Agricultural Service, and of which not to exceed $589,000 may be transferred to and merged with the appropriation for the salaries and expenses of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order or amendments to the balance of title V?

If not, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—RELATED AGENCIES AND FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Food and Drug Administration, including hire and purchase of passenger motor vehicles; for rental of special purpose space in the District of Columbia or elsewhere; and for miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities, authorized and approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed $25,000; $914,394,000, of which not to exceed $79,423,000 in fees pursuant to section 736 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act may be credited to this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided*, That fees derived from applications received during fiscal year 1995 shall be subject to the fiscal year 1995 limitation: *Provided further*, That none of these funds shall be used to develop, establish, or operate any program of user fees authorized by 31 U.S.C. 9701.

None of the funds in this Act may be used to enforce rules or regulations for a selenium supplement level in animal feeds below 0.3 parts per million.

In addition, of the foregoing amount such sums as may be necessary may be used for the inspection of mammography facilities, notwithstanding section 354(r) of the Public Health Service Act. Fees collected under said Act shall be credited to the foregoing account and shall remain available until expended.

In addition to amounts provided, proceeds from the sale of any animals that are surplus to FDA's needs shall be retained by the Food and Drug Administration and credited to the salaries and expenses appropriation for 1995.

BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For plans, construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of or used by the Food and Drug Administration, where not otherwise provided, $18,150,000, to remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): *Provided*, That the Food and Drug Administration may accept donated land in Montgomery and/or Prince George's Counties, Maryland.

RENTAL PAYMENTS (FDA)

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For payment of space rental and related costs pursuant to Public Law 92-313 for programs and activities of the Food and Drug Administration which are included in this Act, $46,294,000: *Provided*, That in the event the Food and Drug Administration should require modification of space needs, a share of the salaries and expenses appropriation may be transferred to this appropriation, or a share of this appropriation may be transferred to the salaries and expenses appropriation, but such transfers shall not exceed 5 per centum of the funds made available for rental payments (FDA) to or from this account.

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT SERVICE

PAYMENTS TO THE FARM CREDIT SYSTEM FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE CORPORATION

For necessary payments to the Farm Credit System Financial Assistance Corporation by the Secretary of the Treasury, as authorized by section 6.28(c) of the Farm Credit Act of 1971, as amended, for reimbursement of interest expenses incurred by the Financial Assistance Corporation on obligations issued through 1994, as authorized, $57,026,000.

INDEPENDENT AGENCIES

COMMODITY FUTURES TRADING COMMISSION

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles; the rental of space (to include multiple year leases) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; and not to exceed $25,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; $47,480,000, including not to exceed $1,000 for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized to charge fees to cover the cost of Commission-sponsored educational events and symposia, and notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, said fees shall be credited to this account, to be available without further appropriation.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

LIMITATION ON ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES

Not to exceed $40,420,000 (from assessments collected from farm credit institutions and from the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Corporation) shall be obligated during the current fiscal year for administrative expenses as authorized under 12 U.S.C. 2249.

Mr. DURBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that title VI be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order to title VI?

If not, are there amendments to title VI?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF TEXAS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Texas: Page 68, line 14, strike "$914,394,000" and insert "$913,927,000".

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to the House Agriculture appropriations bill that makes a $467,000 cut in the Food and Drug Administration's appropriation level. This tiny cut is designed to make a large point: It is past time that the Federal Government cease to allow unnecessary, unjustified, and in this case, downright unusual, spending to continue merely because it occurs in the dark recesses of the Federal budget.

My amendment cutting $467,000 is designed to equal the difference in the cost of new Public Health Service Commissioned Corps hires and general schedule hires in the next fiscal year. This amendment will not affect a single individual now serving in the corps, nor will it even affect any person who will join the corps before October 1 of this year. What the amendment will do is to send a direct and indisputable signal that it is time the corps shipped out of the FDA.

Why is this necessary? The answers are as many as the corps is obscure. First, allow me to provide a little background on the corps itself. The Public Health Service Commissioned Corps was founded in 1798, when John Adams was President, to treat disabled seamen. Today, there are about 6,500 total individuals in the corps and it is the 500 in the FDA that we are dealing with in this amendment.

The Commissioned Corps is one of the seven uniformed services and they receive benefits that are equal to that of the military. The section of the Public Health Service Act that deals with the corps states:

> Commissioned officers of the Service or their surviving beneficiaries are entitled to all rights, benefits, privileges, and immunities now or hereafter provided for commissioned officers of the Army . . .

While the corps are equal to the military in their benefits, they are not in their duties. Corps officers are not subject to the uniform military code of conduct, which means they have the right to refuse an assignment or transfer simply by exiting the corps. In addition, the corps has not served in a military capacity for a generation.

Quoting from testimony of then-Assistant Secretary for HHS, James O. Mason, before the Energy and Commerce's Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, he explained the reason that none of the corps' officers were activated or called up for Desert Storm as follows:

> The last time the Commissioned Corps was "militarized" was during the Korean conflict. Historically, this power has been used very sparingly by the President. It was not done during the Vietnam war even though the draft was in effect at the time . . .

So the Federal Government is giving military-equal benefits for civilian-

type service. A corps officer with 6 years of service receives approximately $15,000 more annually than a GS-13. This is neither fair to the military officers who make the military sacrifices for the same benefits, nor is it fair to the FDA's civilian employees who do the same work as the FDA's corps officers but at much less cost.

Even if this basic unfairness between Federal employees did not exist, there would still remain the basic unfairness to the American taxpayer. They are the ones required to pick up the tab for the day-to-day discrepancy of paying military benefits for a civilian job. This discrepancy adds up to a huge unfunded liability that the corps is accumulating through their officers' retirement benefits.

Unlike either the military or civilian employees they resemble, corps officers' retirement benefits are not prefunded as are other Federal workers'. Instead, we rely on the antiquated cash-in, cash-out accounting system, whereby we merely pay the current year's retiree costs without ever looking ahead to set anything aside for when that day will come for the current officers. The same myopic approach virtually bankrupted the Social Security trust fund and is one we have wisely abandoned for all current Federal employees.

But we have not abandoned it for the corps. As a result, according to the independent audit of the corps' retirement system, the unfunded accrued liability for the corps was $3.6 billion as of September 1, 1992. Every day that we do nothing to correct this, it increases. This amendment says that day has come today.

This amendment is about small money but big principles. It is time that we get rid of basic unfairness. It is time we get rid of the illogic of having two personnel systems to do one job. It is time we get rid of an antiquated anachronism that racks up costs we don't need to be paying today and makes no plans to pay them tomorrow.

We can do these things now by passing this amendment. We can do it without unfairly hitting anyone in the corps. We can do it without unfairly hitting American farmers, because the FDA, which alone will be affected by this amendment, is not part of the USDA.

I urge Members of this House, who have supported governmentwide reforms, to support this one today and vote to pass this amendment.

□ 1100

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Chairman, for those who are following this debate, we have now shifted into the Food and Drug Administration. I hope we will take a moment to reflect on the fact that this important small agency is under continuing pressure. FDA responds to consumers across America who rely on it for the safety, effectiveness, and wholesomeness of all of the food and drugs which come across the tables of our homes and in our medicine chests. The agency also responds to Congress. Year in and year out Congress adds new responsibilities to the Food and Drug Administration, valuable important responsibilities which each of us as Members of Congress consider to be necessary for the health of our Nation.

In the not too distant past, we have given new responsibilities to FDA to inspect mammography clinics across America. This is to make sure that our wives and mothers and sisters and friends who visit those clinics can leave confident that the person who has been there to help them is a qualified professional person and that the equipment works accurately. I think we all understand the importance of this.

When we consider the critical issues related to the Nation's blood supply, particularly in this era of sexually transmitted diseases, the role of the Food and Drug Administration is so important.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas because he is striking a little over $400,000 from the Food and Drug Administration. His quarrel is with the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps, and I understand that. But the net effect of his amendment is to take money away from the Food and Drug Administration.

Because of deficit reduction, the Food and Drug Administration is already going to see a reduction in the personnel available to perform its valuable functions. In effect, they have told us that some 350 employees, or about 4 percent of their personnel, are going to be at risk because of our budget recommendation. The gentleman's cut of $400,000-plus will mean even more people will be gone from the Food and Drug Administration. I would submit to the gentleman that this is not the time to do this. If there was ever a moment in our Nation's history when we should value this agency and strive to find ways to increase funding for the professional personnel who work there, this is the moment. For the gentleman from Texas to come before us and to suggest that we cut back in those personnel I think is shortsighted.

Mr. Chairman, let me address his specific point. I do not quarrel with the gentleman from Texas that the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps itself should be evaluated. We should ask the hard questions of this group of Federal employees as we do so many others, whether their job is necessary, whether in fact they are cost efficient in the way they perform it and what their future might be. But I would suggest to the gentleman that just making a cut in the Food and Drug Administration budget is not going to have that effect. It will reduce the number of people needed for the important jobs we described earlier at a time when we should not do that.

I am told the Public Health Service Commissioned Corps is a valuable part of the Food and Drug Administration. At a time when we need doctors and medical professionals to review new drugs and new medical devices to find the medical breakthroughs which our families rely on to save lives across America, we should not be reducing the number of people who work at the Food and Drug Administration.

I will say to the gentleman, we have faced the responsibility under this budget resolution to reduce their budget as we have had to, but we should not cut it any further. I stand in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas. I hope he will reconsider.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would support the gentleman if he could accomplish what I think he is trying to do here, is to question the work of the Public Health Service. I think a lot of us question that. But certainly our chairman has said about the need. We are constantly asking the Food and Drug Administration to assume more responsibility and they cannot do it without the people. We maybe ought to move their people around a little bit and help them do that, but this cut the gentleman is doing here will not accomplish really what he is trying to do, unfortunately. Just a mere dollar cut will not do that.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a couple of points and also respond to what my friend, the gentleman from Illinois, has stated as well.

This amendment does not have to result in the cut of one individual in the Commissioned Corps. The cuts that I have proposed represent only the difference in salary between a typical Federal employee and a Commissioned Corps officer in the next year. It is not adversely going to impact one individual who is now serving as a member of the Commissioned Corps.

Second, we still have not addressed the problem of a $3.7 billion unfunded liability that is involved here. This is the only group of employees, whether we talk about Federal employees, civilian employees, or military personnel, who do not have to prepay their retirement. I suspect that the gentleman from Illinois would agree with me, we

do not want more unfunded liabilities, and we certainly ought to abolish this type of antiquated accounting.

Lastly, I would certainly say to my friend from Illinois that I agree with him on the importance of the FDA. No one is quibbling about that. We are talking specifically about the Commissioned Corps which was founded in 1798 when John Adams was President to try to help disabled seamen. If there is anything, any Government program that is out of date, it is this one.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Again I think that this amendment he has offered does not accomplish what he is intending to do here. I cannot speak for the committee, but I think there ought to be a review, an examination next year.

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

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I concur with that. I have expressed that opinion to the gentleman from Texas, which is why I hope he will consider withdrawing this amendment. This is an agency which provides core personnel for many different Federal agencies, not just the Food and Drug Administration. The gentleman raises serious and legitimate questions about its need, its future and how it is funded. I would implore the gentleman not to cut the FDA personnel budget in his effort to raise this issue.

I will join the gentleman in suggesting that we take a bipartisan look at the future of the corps. I think his contribution today has been very valuable to this debate, but I hope he will not cut the personnel at FDA.

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the director of the Food and Drug Administration has come before us continually every year begging for more money. He just cannot do the job that we are requiring of FDA, to make all the examinations, the tests, everything we require them to do. There are new drugs coming on. Right now they do not have adequate personnel.

Again, the gentleman from Texas is trying to accomplish something that the amendment just simply is not touching. I think the Chair has given us some assurance that we will examine the uniformed service again next year, making sure we are getting efficiency and effective dollar for what we are spending on the program. I think the commitment the chairman has made here, I hope the gentleman from Texas will consider it.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MYERS of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Illinois. I appreciate them saying we are raising a serious and legitimate issue. I look for the chairman's support in the future. I would not ask for a recorded vote right now.

□ 1110

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SMITH].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there further amendments to title VI?

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

Mr. Chairman, there is an issue of enormous consequence that I fear has not gotten the kind of discussion and attention that it needs from this body, and that has to do with the introduction of rBGH, Monsanto's bovine growth hormone, into the marketplace and the impact it is going to have on family farming, on animal health, and perhaps on human health.

Also I must tell you that I am extremely concerned about the role that Food and Drug Administration has played in this entire process, and among many other concerns that I have is that at least three high-ranking members in the Food and Drug Administration formerly were employed by the Monsanto Corp., and we believe may have played an important role in the whole approval process.

Mr. Chairman, the simple fact of the matter is that at a time when we already have a milk surplus in the United States, we do not need bovine growth hormone, which is increasing milk production and increasing the surplus. The fact of the matter is that the Office of Management and Budget has estimated that because of the use of BST, there will be an increase in the Federal deficit by $500 million over the next 5 years.

Why do we need a synthetic hormone to increase milk production when we already have a milk surplus?

Second of all, the facts are very clear that BST makes cows sick. It significantly increases the rate of mastitis in cows. With increased mastitis in cows, farmers are obliged to use more antibiotics. Why, in fact, would the American people want to consume milk from sicker cows than is presently the case?

The Food and Drug Administration has said that antibiotics will control the problem, and that it is "a manageable risk." But why do we need any risk at all when we already have a surplus of milk on the market?

Mr. Chairman, in my State of Vermont over the last 20 years, we have lost many, many family farms, and that is true all over this country. The reason that we are losing family farms is because the milk surplus is driving milk prices down, and farmers in many instances are receiving 50 percent of the income that they did 15 years ago, and they cannot survive on this income.

For those of us who are concerned about the preservation of the family farm, it seems to me we must address this issue, and it is incomprehensible to me that at a time we hear so much discussion about the deficit that we are not addressing this issue. At a time when we consumers are more and more concerned about the quality and the purity of the foods that they are ingesting, it seems to me that when scientists have concerns about the BST residue that will remain in the finished product, the milk we drink, it is an issue we must address.

Mr. Chairman, Monsanto is a multibillion-dollar corporation. They have spent $300 million on the development of this product. It seems to me that it would be appropriate for the U.S. Congress to begin to stand up for family farmers all over this country who have enormous concerns about the impact of this development on their future. It seems to me imperative that the Congress stand up for consumers who are saying, "We want a pure product. We do not want cows to be injected with a synthetic hormone which makes them sicker so that Monsanto can make more money."

Mr. Chairman, I have been asked to withdraw the amendment which I presented today, and I will do so.

I intend next week, however, to introduce a major piece of legislation which deals with the labeling issue that the FDA has done such a terrible job on, the labeling issue which says that consumers in America have the right to know whether the dairy product they are consuming comes from cows in injected with BST or whether it does not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. SANDERS was allowed to proceed for 30 additional seconds.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I would hope the chairman of the committee will work with me in allowing more debate, more exploration of this terribly important issue that has not gotten the attention that it deserves, and I would hope that I will be able to work with the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], further on this issue.

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

Although I may disagree with the gentlemen from Vermont on his position on this issue, he certainly deserves an opportunity to be heard on his position, and I think some of the questions he has raised should be answered.

I will work with him to try to achieve that.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say that those of us on

the Committee on Agriculture have looked at this issue, and I want to assure the American public here and now that every drop of milk that they are drinking today and every drop of milk that a schoolchild is drinking today, whether it comes from cows that have had the additive or not, is healthful, wholesome, and delicious, and I hope that people continue to drink milk, because no matter what some of these people say, all the milk is wholesome. Every cow that has ever, every cow that has ever given milk has BST or BGH naturally forming. There is no difference between what Monsanto has produced and what the cow produces. It is all the same milk, and you cannot tell the difference, and it is all delicious.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I also come from a dairy State, and we also want people to continue to drink milk, which we agree is very healthy. But would the gentleman disagree with me that scientists have determined quite clearly, and I think Monsanto itself would not deny, that cows injected with BST become sicker, and there is a significant increase of mastitis?

Mr. VOLKMER. If the gentleman will yield further, no, I will not agree with that. I disagree with that strenuously.

Mr. SANDERS. The gentleman disagrees with that? Really?

Mr. VOLKMER. Wholeheartedly. They do not become sick.

Mr. DURBIN. Reclaiming my time, I believe that the gentleman have suggested that perhaps another debate is needed on this.

I will tell you this: I have visited a large dairy in my area, Prairie Farms Dairy; the milk that comes from those cows before it comes to the table is examined and tested three different times, three different times for the presence of antibiotics. If there is any evidence of an unwanted residue, the entire load of milk is destroyed.

There is a very careful testing procedure, monitored by the Federal Government. Consumers across America should understand, as the gentleman from Missouri says, that the milk that they are being given in their stores and in classrooms is healthy, safe, and wholesome.

The gentleman from Vermont has raised other issues which we can address, but that, I think, we all agree on.

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

Mr. Chairman, I will not prolong the argument, but I think the gentleman from Vermont has a very important request to make, and that is something that we should have been doing a long time ago is getting to the real scientific basis accurately about what is in foodstuffs, what does BST amount to and all the rest of it, because too many times we have those kinds of media hypes and some of the rest to fearmonger the food supply, and it has gone awry and worked to our detriment for too many years.

I think we ought to have a real good discussion on this and some real good factfinding and real good knowledge and also turn around and tell the American people: "Quit listening to these folks that are trying to scare the living bejiminies out of you over what is in the milk."

If there is a danger, let us find it. If there is not, let us decide to go on about our business and get on with the business of being good, healthy consuming Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlemen from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS].

□ 1120

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

Mr. SKEEN. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I absolutely agree with the gentleman. We certainly do not want fear mongering. But what we absolutely do want, especially in this era when more and more pesticides and chemicals are being used; I think the American consumer does want to know absolutely and unequivocally that the product that he or she is consuming is, in fact, a healthy product, and I look forward to working with the gentleman to move in that direction.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS], and I think we need to build that level of confidence.

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to put in a word here because I know of the concern of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS]; I know of his genuine concern about this issue, not just on human health, but also on dairy herds and smaller farmers who may be disadvantaged because of the additional use of this particular additive. Let me say to the gentleman: "Mr. SANDERS, I know you had several amendments, and you have kindly withdrawn them today, but, in reading some of them, I think that at the same time our committee extends the offer to work with you wholeheartedly, I think some effort has to be put in at the authorizing committee level as well with the new farm bill that is coming up." And I would just say to the gentleman: "If you have not pursued those courses as fully as you might this year, I think in the future we would be happy to help you on that score as well."

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. KAPTUR. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, that is precisely what we intend to do. I think one of the major issues, as I mentioned a moment ago, that we want to address is the labeling issue within the authorizing committee. I think there cannot be debate about whether or not the American people have the right to know where the milk comes from that they are drinking. They do have that right, and I am very proud to say that in the State of Vermont we have, in fact, passed labeling legislation, and I think similar legislation should be passed nationally. But I would love to work with the gentlewoman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] in the authorizing committee on these issues.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VII—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 701. Within the unit limit of cost fixed by law, appropriations and authorizations made for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year 1995 under this Act shall be available for the purchase, in addition to those specifically provided for, of not to exceed 706 passenger motor vehicles, of which 705 shall be for replacement only, and for the hire of such vehicles.

SEC. 702. Funds in this Act available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901–5902).

SEC. 703. Not less than $1,500,000 of the appropriations of the Department of Agriculture in this Act for research and service work authorized by the Acts of August 14, 1946, and July 28, 1954, and (7 U.S.C. 427, 1621–1629), and by chapter 63 of title 31, United States Code, shall be available for contracting in accordance with said Acts and chapter.

SEC. 704. The cumulative total of transfers to the Working Capital Fund for the purpose of accumulating growth capital for data services and National Finance Center operations shall not exceed $2,000,000: *Provided*, That no funds in this Act appropriated to an agency of the Department shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund without the approval of the agency administrator.

SEC. 705. New obligational authority provided for the following appropriation items in this Act shall remain available until expended (7 U.S.C. 2209b): Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the contingency fund to meet emergency conditions, and Integrated Systems Acquisition Project; Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, salaries and expenses funds made available to county committees; Foreign Agricultural Service, Middle-Income Country Training Program; higher education graduate fellowships grants under section 1417(b)(6) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(6)); and capacity building grants to colleges eligible to receive funds under the Act of August 30, 1890, including Tuskegee University.

New obligational authority for the Boll Weevil Program; up to 10 per centum of the Screwworm Program of the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service; funds appropriated for Rental Payments; and higher education minority scholars programs under section 1417(b)(5) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(5)) shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 706. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 707. Not to exceed $50,000 of the appropriations available to the Department of Agriculture in this Act shall be available to provide appropriate orientation and language training pursuant to Public Law 94-449.

SEC. 708. No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to pay negotiated indirect cost rates on cooperative agreements or similar arrangements between the United States Department of Agriculture and nonprofit institutions in excess of 10 per centum of the total direct cost of the agreement when the purpose of such cooperative arrangements is to carry out programs of mutual interest between the two parties. This does not preclude appropriate payment of indirect costs on grants and contracts with such institutions when such indirect costs are computed on a similar basis for all agencies for which appropriations are provided in this Act.

SEC. 709. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, commodities acquired by the Department in connection with Commodity Credit Corporation and section 32 price support operations may be used, as authorized by law (15 U.S.C. 714c and 7 U.S.C. 612c), to provide commodities to individuals in cases of hardship as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 710. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs in excess of the amounts specified in this Act; nor shall this or any other provision of law require a reduction in the level of rental space or services below that of fiscal year 1994 or prohibit an expansion of rental space or services with the use of funds otherwise appropriated in this Act. Further, no agency of the Department of Agriculture, from funds otherwise available, shall reimburse the General Services Administration for payment of space rental and related costs provided to such agency at a percentage rate which is greater than is available in the case of funds appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 711. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to restrict the authority of the Commodity Credit Corporation to lease space for its own use or to lease space on behalf of other agencies of the Department of Agriculture when such space will be jointly occupied.

SEC. 712. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to pay indirect costs on research grants awarded competitively by the Cooperative State Research Service that exceed 14 per centum of total Federal funds provided under each award.

SEC. 713. Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, all loan levels provided in this Act shall be considered estimates, not limitations.

SEC. 714. Appropriations to the Department of Agriculture for the cost of direct and guaranteed loans made available in fiscal year 1995 shall remain available until expended to cover obligations made in fiscal year 1995 for the following accounts: Rural Development Insurance Fund Program Account; Rural Development Loan Fund Program Account; the Rural Telephone Bank Program Account; the Rural Electrification and Telephone Loans Program Account; and the REA Economic Development Loans Program Account.

SEC. 715. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a Market Promotion Program pursuant to section 203 (7 U.S.C. 5623) of the Agricultural Trade Act of 1978, with respect to tobacco or if the aggregate amount of funds and/or commodities under such program exceeds $90,000,000.

SEC. 716. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to enroll in excess of 100,000 acres in the fiscal year 1995 Wetlands Reserve Program, as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3837.

SEC. 717. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to enroll additional acres in the Conservation Reserve Program authorized by 16 U.S.C. 3831-3845.

SEC. 718. Such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1995 pay raises for programs funded by this Act shall be absorbed within the levels appropriated in this Act.

SEC. 719. (a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the funds the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c; popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS; REQUIREMENT REGARDING NOTICE.—

(1) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or product that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided using funds made available in this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving the assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(2) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds made available in this Act, the head of each Federal agency shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in paragraph (1) by the Congress.

(c) PROHIBITION OF CONTRACTS WITH PERSONS FALSELY LABELING PRODUCTS AS MADE IN AMERICA.—If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, the person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds made available in this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in sections 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

SEC. 720. Notwithstanding the Federal Grant and Cooperative Agreement Act, marketing services of the Agricultural Marketing Service may use cooperative agreements to reflect a relationship between Agricultural Marketing Service and a State or Cooperator to carry out agricultural marketing programs.

SEC. 721. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out an export enhancement program (estimated to be $1,000,000,000 in the President's fiscal year 1995 Budget Request (H. Doc. 103-179)) if the aggregate amount of funds and/or commodities under such program exceeds $850,000,000.

SEC. 722. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used to pay the salaries of personnel who carry out a sunflower and cottonseed oil export program authorized by section 1541 of Public Law 101-624 if the aggregate amount of funds and/or commodities under such program exceeds $27,000,000.

SEC. 723. (a) None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to provide a total amount of payments to a person to support the price of honey under section 207 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446h) and section 405A of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1425a) in excess of $0 in the 1994 crop year.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to provide for a total amount of payments and/or total amount of loan forfeitures to a person to support the price of honey under section 207 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1446h) and section 405A of such Act (7 U.S.C. 1425a) in excess of zero dollars in the 1994 crop year.

SEC. 724. None of the funds in this Act may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to warrant to the Secretary of the Treasury a payment out of the Treasury of the United States for purposes specified in the tenth and eleventh paragraphs under the heading "Emergency Appropriations" of the Act of March 4, 1907 (7 U.S.C. 321, et seq.): *Provided*, That $2,850,000 is hereby appropriated for higher education challenge grants under section 1417(b)(1) of the National Agricultural Research, Extension, and Teaching Policy Act of 1977, as amended (7 U.S.C. 3152(b)(1)), including administrative expenses.

SEC. 725. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act $25,000,000 is hereby appropriated for unforeseen expenses due to the reorganization and streamlining of the agencies of the Department of Agriculture which may be transferred to any agency of the Department funded in this Act for its use in meeting these unforeseen needs: *Provided*, That such funds shall not be available for obligation prior to September 29, 1995.

SEC. 726. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Food Stamp Program may be used in violation of 7 U.S.C. sec. 2015(f) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 727. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Conservation Reserve Program may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1498.4(a) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 728. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Wetlands Reserve Program may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1498.4(a) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 729. None of the funds made available in this Act for the Agricultural Water Quality Protection Program may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1498.4(a) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 730. None of the funds made available in this Act for Integrated Farm Management Program Option may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1498.4(a) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 731. None of the funds made available in this Act for Farm Labor Housing Grants (Section 516) may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1944.9(c) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 732. None of the funds made available in this Act for Rural Housing Loans (section 502) may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1944.9(c) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 733. None of the funds made available in this Act for Rural Rental Housing Loans

(section 515) may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1944.9(c) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 734. None of the funds made available in this Act for Rural Rental Assistance Payments (section 521) may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1944.9(c) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 735. None of the funds made available in this Act for Rural Housing Self-Help Technical Assistance Grants may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1944.9(c) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 736. None of the funds made available in this Act for Rural Housing Site Loans (sections 523 and 524) may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1944.9(c) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 737. None of the funds made available in this Act for Farm Labor Housing Loans and Grants may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1944.9(c) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 738. None of the funds made available in this Act for Rural Rental Housing Loans may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1944.9(c) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 739. None of the funds made available in this Act for Farm Ownership Loans may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1943.12(a)(1) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 740. None of the funds made available in this Act for Emergency Loans may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1945.162(b)(1) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

SEC. 741. None of the funds made available in this Act for Farm Operating Loans may be used in violation of 7 CFR 1941.12(a)(1) or of any applicable Federal law or regulation of the United States.

Mr. DURBIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the bill through page 83, line 2, be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there points of order to title VII?

If not, are there amendments to title VII?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. KREIDLER

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KREIDLER: On page 80, strike lines 3 through 10, and renumber the following section numbers accordingly.

Mr. KREIDLER. Mr. Chairman, we all support the savings Secretary Espy wants to achieve by reorganizing the Department of Agriculture. Most of those savings are assumed in this bill.

But in case this Congress does not pass a reorganization bill, the Appropriations Committee has included a contingency fund of $25 million. While that might seem like a sensible fallback plan, in this case, it would make more sense to move forward and enact the reorganization.

In fact, that is happening. The House Committee on Agriculture is marking up a reorganization bill, and the Senate committee has already done so. We should pass that legislation and lock in those savings. We should not create a contingency fund that makes it any easier to delay the streamlining USDA needs.

The committee report says "there might be additional expenses that were not foreseen" when the reorganization plan was submitted to Congress. With the greatest respect to the committee, I do not think that is a good enough reason to spend taxpayers' money.

This amendment would strike the $25 million contingency fund. It would not affect the funding of any of the current programs in this bill. But it would help us make sure that reorganizing the Department actually saves money.

I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. HOKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER].

Mr. Chairman, as you know, I have a similar amendment at the desk, and what I would urge my colleagues to do is to slash what amounts to a $25 million slush fund that was not requested by the administration and showed up, I think, as something of a curiosity to pay for "unforeseen experiences" due to the reorganization and streamlining of USDA's legendary bureaucracy. Why on earth we need $25 million in an effort to downsize and make the existing bureaucracy smaller than it is today is completely beyond me, and I am sure it is beyond the taxpayers. Nowhere other than in Washington do we appropriate extra dollars to save money.

Interestingly, Mr. Chairman, the authors of the provision apparently believe that the Secretary's reorganization plan is going to incur costs that even the Department itself failed to anticipate because the White House has not asked for any of this money in the budget.

The other curious thing about this particular line item is that the subcommittee only allows the Secretary of Agriculture to use this money during the last 48 hours of the fiscal year, and the end result of that budgetary sleight of hand is that the bill for the provision will not come due until fiscal year 1996, 16 months from now, which means that CBO does not score it for fiscal year 1995, and yet the money is still appropriated in committee.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, the trick is on the American taxpayers. It is a remarkable way to appropriate money that is not otherwise appropriated.

Adopting the amendment will not in any way impede Secretary Espy's efforts in this manner, and adopting this amendment will ensure that downsizing will actually save money for the taxpayers, which is what downsizing is supposed to do.

So, Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER] and urge a "yes" vote on striking section 725 from the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I also have an amendment that would delete section 725 and save that $25 million appropriation. A lot of common sense and logic has already been stated, and I, therefore, ask that we support this amendment.

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

Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER]. Let me tell my colleagues why.

When we crafted this provision in the bill, we were not certain that the Committee on Agriculture would be addressing the question of reorganization. I am happy to report they have started that, and that gives us some assurance that our assumption of savings through that reorganization of $135 million will take place. We have set this $25 million in place for the Department's reorganization much as major corporations will set off a charge against income when they either lay off personnel or go into some major reorganization. The fact is that in reorganization there is initial expense involved, and we were trying to anticipate it with this language. But because of the activity of the Committee on Agriculture moving forward on reorganization, Mr. Chairman, it is our feeling at this point that it will not be necessary.

So, I support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER], and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, we also support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER] on this side, and we think it is a good move and have no objection to it.

□ 1130

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. KREIDLER].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, it is our intention to withdraw this amendment, but I think it is important that this body be informed of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will suspend, the Clerk will first report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Insert on page 83 after line 2, the following new section:

"Sec. 742. Notwithstanding any other provision of law or as may otherwise be provided in this Act, funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for the salaries and expenses of employees of the Department of Agriculture its agencies and offices who are located in the Department's national headquarters shall be reduced in a proportionate amount and in a manner determined by the Secretary of Agriculture that will produce an amount equal to $103,000,000 that shall be utilized by the Secretary for an increase in the salaries and expenses of the Food Safety and Inspection Service as otherwise provided in this Act: *Provided* that the amount provided for salaries and expenses of Food Safety and Inspection Service to carry on the services authorized by the Federal Meat Inspection Act, as amended, and the Poultry Products Inspection Act, as amended, shall be a total appropriation for fiscal year 1995 of $533,929,900.—

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

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] reserves a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, still reserving my point of order, if the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] would agree, I make the following unanimous consent request: that all debate on this amendment, which will be withdrawn, be limited to 10 minutes, with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] controlling 5 minutes, and I will control the other 5 minutes and share the time with the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN] if he seeks time.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, of great concern to agriculture in this country is the taking away of $103 million of needed funds in the food safety area for inspection of meat animals. This amendment takes out $103 million from the overstaffed, somewhat bloated Washington, DC bureaucracy of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and makes sure that we have enough money to keep food safe in this country by applying these funds, $103 million, to the Food Safety Inspection Program.

We have a serious problem because this budget is predicated on the assumption that there are going to be fee increases passed on to pay for the funding of this food inspection service, and one of two parties is going to pay for that user fee increase. It is either going to be the consumers of this country or it is going to be the farmers of this country as lower prices are offered to farmers for their products, to pay for the ensuing fee increase for food inspection, or a more likely result is an increase in costs to the consumers of this country because these fees are going to be passed on, either up or down. If there is any lack of availability of supply, then what will happen in this country is that the consumers are going to pay for that fee increase.

So, Mr. Chairman, we are suggesting that we at an earlier time start reducing the bureaucracy in the U.S. Department of Agriculture to pay for these services.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding.

I am a cosponsor with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] on this amendment. I think it is a well-intentioned amendment, and I think it goes to the heart of the problem, which is that we have a large headquarters staff, some 15,000 Department of Agriculture employees in this city whose payroll and support expense in close to $1 billion. If we cut that by 10 or 15 percent, we would have the money to meet the meat inspection standards that are presently required.

I understand that the Department of Agriculture is going to take, over the next 5 years, a hit in terms of about 7,500 employees. But my feeling is, along with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH], that we could take a bigger cut in the headquarters employees, the employees of USDA who are here in Washington, DC, and make this meat inspection program work, which would accrue not only to the consumers who have an interest, obviously, in healthy meat products but also those who are involved in the agriculture industry, particularly the ranching industry and the meat-production industry throughout this country.

So we need to start this process a little bit earlier. We want to go on record to let the House know we are going to be doing that.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for his authorship of this amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, let me just conclude by reminding our colleagues in this Chamber that the consumers in this country eat the best food, the highest quality at the lowest price relative to their incomes, than any other place in the world. We are spending 10 percent of our take-home dollar for food that is much better than that in any other country. So we should be very careful of taking action that is going to increase the price of food in this country.

Mr. Chairman, with the concurrence of my cosponsor and if there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be withdrawn.

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

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MICHIGAN

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] reserves a point of order, and the Clerk will report the amendment subject to the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Page 83, after line 2, insert the following new section:

SEC. 742. Federal Drug Administration (FDA) salaries and expenses shall be reduced $52,000,000 and such amount shall be deposited in the salaries and expenses account of the Food Safety Inspection Service (FSIS).

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a variation of the same theme in the prior amendment, and I make the point of order that it is in violation of rule XXI, clause 3, and that it is legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is entitled to be heard on the point of order.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, this amendment does not violate a point of order because it specifically reduces appropriations that are now a line item in the bill, and it transfers part of that line item to the Food Safety Inspection Service. That would be my objection to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SPRATT). The Chair will rule that this amendment is legislation requiring the reduction of salaries and not merely confined to funds in the bill. Therefore, the gentleman's point of order is sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would conclude by saying that it is an expression of the seriousness of cutting out money from the Food Inspection Service.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] move to strike the last word?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment was ruled out on a point of order.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments——

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will suspend, first the Clerk will read the last three lines of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I expect, since the floor manager has, as we just saw, indicated that he will move that the Committee rise and report the bill back to the House——

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure I understand the parliamentary state of play here.

If, in fact, the Clerk finished reading the last three lines of the bill and I make a motion to rise——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that I was on my feet.

Mr. DURBIN. No, no, I am not objecting to that at all. I am going to protect the gentleman's right to object and make whatever statement he might want to make. But I think I may have inappropriately started to make my motion before the Clerk had read the last three lines. So I will protect the gentleman's right to make his statement in reference to this same motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, did the Clerk finish reading the bill? Did the Clerk read the last three lines?

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has not read the last three lines.

Mr. DURBIN. I would like to see the Clerk read the last three lines.

The CHAIRMAN. First, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRABACHER] is recognized for 5 minutes. The gentleman from California has the floor.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, we were talking about a motion to rise, and this is not just a procedural matter at this point.

Mr. Chairman, if the motion to rise succeeds, it will mean that for another year money in this agricultural appropriations bill will go to illegal aliens even as many citizens have to go without the very same benefits.

This policy is wrong, Mr. Chairman. This is a policy that is wrong because our country should be handing out any benefits to illegal aliens on the same basis as American citizens. This policy is wrong because it also entices more and more people to come into our country illegally. It is especially wrong because it adds an irresistible lure to women of other countries to come here and to have their babies. It is already a major problem when we see pregnant women surging across our borders, knowing that their children once born in the United States will become U.S. citizens immediately and thus also immediately making them eligible for Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

□ 1140

Of course, the benefits under the WIC Program, which is part of this bill, start even before the baby comes.

Mr. Chairman, this policy is wrong because it is unfair to American citizens and legal residents, who should always come first when taxpayers' money is being spent.

A yes vote on the motion to rise is a vote to continue this failed policy. This motion will deny me the right to offer an amendment which I have which says basically "no more." My proposed amendment will stop the nonsensical funding of giving benefits and funding benefits to illegal aliens.

Let me offer my colleagues a major example of what will happen if this motion to rise passes. This will fund the Women, Infants and Children Program, the WIC Program, a program which I have strongly supported in the past and do so today. But committee staff estimates the money in this bill will only be enough to serve 75 percent of those eligible.

Under current policy, if this bill continues, 75 percent of illegal aliens, 75 percent of legal residents, and 75 percent of American citizens who are eligible can actually be helped by the bill. Because we do not have enough money to help everybody, every illegal alien who receives benefits under this program is getting those benefits instead of an American citizen or legal resident.

Now, some may say surely we do not want people coming here and giving birth, illegal aliens or whatever, to low weight babies and babies that are not healthy. But that is misplaced compassion toward illegal aliens, because it means that a pregnant American citizen or legal resident will have the same malnourished or unhealthy baby.

Let us stop this insane policy. If we defeat this motion to rise, I have an amendment proposed that will actually make it illegal and end the policy of providing benefits to illegal aliens. So I ask for a "no" vote on this motion.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to engage in some dialog on the issue of whether or not we are really talking about American citizens or not. Regardless of whether the mother is legal or not, if the child is born in this country, that will be still, under our constitutional system, an American citizen, and our responsibilities for that low-birthweight baby, as the gentleman indicated, are not only real, they are very, very costly. So are we not being a little penny-wise and pound-foolish to not treat children who are likely to be born here as American citizens?

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, the logic of the gentleman's argument and the compassion of his argument is reasonable. However, if you take a responsible look at what that also creates, it also creates a lure for women all over the world who are pregnant to come to the United States, and that makes the problem in the long run even more difficult to solve, because we have limited resources.

Mr. FAZIO. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I understand the concern about the lure. Most evidence reports that people who come here come here for employment, for work, for income, and the relative number who come for benefits is still to be documented as any sizable amount at all.

The point is, there are people who are here. Whether they should be or not, they are here. And if we end up with the burden of that low birth weight child, we end up incurring costs as taxpayers that far exceed what would normally occur. So it seems to me that we are missing the point, if we think we should exclude benefits from American citizens.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, it is a major problem in California, as the gentleman is aware, of people coming across the border to have babies. If the bill only funds 75 percent of those eligible, what we are duly saying is if we are servicing an illegal alien, that means that that money comes directly from the funds that are available for another American citizen or legal resident who is not getting those funds, because they will not have the funds now.

Mr. FAZIO. If the gentleman will yield further, I share the gentleman's support for WIC. I would like to see a greater percentage of our population gaining access to the program. Funding is not the only issue here. We have an awfully difficult time reaching the low income mothers and children who benefit from this program. There are many obviously who would not support this bill. But I would hope we would be certainly careful about the misallocation of resources.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I ask a no vote "on" the motion to rise.

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

Mr. Chairman, I have another amendment at the desk that will not be considered once we rise, but I would just like to call to the attention of my colleagues the composition of this amendment.

Last year I introduced an amendment in the Committee on the Budget that would allow the Secretary of HUD to examine the IRS documents to verify income of those requesting rental

assistance through the HUD administration of housing. This amendment gives that same authority to the Secretary of Agriculture for the one million homes that are now being subsidized for rental income in that department.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, matching IRS data with housing recipients' reported income will save $1.6 billion over 5 years for HUD. If you apply the same ratio of housing to the Farmers Home Administration within the USDA, the savings will be between $300 million and $400 million over 5 years. In general, we simply subsidize rental income based on the calculation that one-third of an individual's income should go to rental housing.

GAO did a study in 1992 that demonstrated that one out of five subsidized households understated income. The potential savings to the U.S. Government is substantial. I am informed by the esteemed chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], that the process of putting that amendment in language of legislation that is moving through the body and out of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs is in place.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I support the idea. The gentleman is on the right track with wage verification. The gentleman from New Mexico and I and the subcommittee have investigated this. It is an important part of any reinvestigation of any housing programs. This is on the right track to make sure deserving people are the ones that are given the opportunity to live in this housing.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

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

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to the gentleman from California, who has suggested that the motion to rise should be a referendum on the question of whether or not the WIC Program provides benefits to those who are either undocumented or illegal aliens.

The gentleman raises an interesting policy point, but I do not believe that it is a point that can be or should be addressed in the agriculture appropriations bill. The gentleman's quarrel is not with our appropriations bill. The gentleman's quarrel is with the 14th amendment to the U.S. Constitution, which I will read:

> All persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to the jurisdiction thereof are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside.

I think there is opportunity and I think perhaps a need for us to debate the wisdom of that language. But unless and until we do, the simple fact of the matter is that a mother who is an illegal alien, who presents herself to a WIC Program for services, may in and of herself not be documented and not be legal, but if the baby she is carrying in her womb is born in the United States, by virtue of the 14th amendment to the Constitution that baby is a U.S. citizen. And if that baby is a citizen, I believe that we have a vested interest in that new citizen being healthy, that that mother have milk to drink during her pregnancy, that she have nutritional information, so that that new American citizen is not born sick and a burden not only to the family, but also to our Treasury.

The gentleman raises an interesting point, but his point should be addressed to the Bill of Rights, and not to the Agriculture appropriations bill.

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

Mr. DURBIN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman at least then concede that with the limited funds that we have, whether it is for this program or for other programs, but especially this program where only 75 percent of the eligible are actually being funded, that that means U.S. citizens are then being denied those funds to give to people who are not here legally?

□ 1150

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman misses the point. The baby in the womb is going to be a U.S. citizen. The baby who benefits from WIC is going to be a U.S. citizen the moment it is born on U.S. soil. That is what our Constitution says. Until that has changed, that baby is receiving the same type of benefits as any other citizen of the United States.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that baby in the womb is not a citizen until he or she is born in the United States. I guess the gentleman is suggesting that those people should not be sent back to their home country, if they are here illegally, but, instead, should be provided benefits.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, the point I have to make to the gentleman is that we have to make a decision here. The decision is pretty basic. A pregnant mother presents herself for milk that she can drink during pregnancy to deliver a healthy baby. I think what the gentleman from California is suggesting is that we should turn her away. I do not believe that is really the thing that we should be doing. If the gentleman wants to suggest an amendment to the Constitution, I think he will be addressing the issue where it should be addressed.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe I disagree on the constitutional question. I think that we have to make some tough decisions here in this body. It is tough, because those who are moral people do not want to say no to a pregnant woman or do not want to say no to anyone else who is in need. But if someone is here illegally and we have limited funds in this country, if we do not have the strength to say no, we are denying these resources to our own people.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I think I have made my point. I really believe the gentleman has a good constitutional argument and an interesting one, but it is not an argument for the Agriculture appropriations bill.

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

For those of my colleagues who are pro-life, I would think that they would agree that a person living in this country who is going to have a U.S. citizen and has made the decision to keep that child that we would do everything because we believe in pro-life to make sure that that baby is a healthy baby, is born healthy and will not be a drain to our system if that baby is born a preemie. Because we know, when babies are born with low weight, that then they take intensive care to continue living.

So for my colleagues who are pro-life and once the mother decides to keep the baby, we ought to ensure that that baby is a healthy baby.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in opposition to the Agriculture, Rural Development, and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1995. I do respect and appreciate the efforts of the subcommittee chairman, Mr. DURBIN, and the ranking member, Mr. SKEEN, and other members of the subcommittee for their hard work and diligence in preparing this package.

Indeed, the Appropriations Committee has probably done the very best it can do in the unfortunate circumstances with which it was confronted, given the budget measure passed by this House and the resulting allocation for agricultural purposes. The cuts in this bill of certain vital programs, however, do not get committed to true deficit reduction purposes. This is genuinely disconcerting to those hard-working American men and women whose livelihood is dependent upon production agriculture.

Clearly, agriculture is willing to pull its fair share of the budget reduction load. Unfortunately, this appropriations measure burdens agriculture far beyond what is fair. The Export Enhancement Program and the Market Promotion Program are both programs that serve a direct link to farm income and profitability—though they both suffer explicit budget hardships under this measure. The Food for Peace Program bears a similar fate. This is a worthy program which serves a dual role of providing a global market source for our farm commodities while feeding the hungry and needy overseas. This is not the time to undermine potential farm commodity sales while our foreign competitors take full advantage of our budgetary miscues.

Another area of significant cuts includes the Watershed and Conservation Program. At the current level of funding, responsible conservation programs can hardly be maintained—let alone promoted or expanded. Last year in Missouri alone, we witnessed a natural disaster of epic proportions and the scars clearly remain. There are presently miles of terraces and waterways that are not floodworthy and pose a tremendous threat to the safety and welfare of thousands of men and women along with their homes and property. These needs are urgent and pose an imminent threat.

In addition, this measure imposes a user fee structure on the meat production industry. This establishes a dangerous precedent. Will we now call upon the meat industry to pay for a service that benefits all consumers but further diminishes a marginal profit line and jeopardizes the jobs of many employed in the meat industry? Meat inspection user fees have been repulsed by this Congress during the years of Republican White House rule and I urge this body to do the same today.

I am also disappointed that the Emergency Food Assistance Program [TEFAP], which received no support from the Clinton administration in this year's budget proposal, was cut $40 million from last year's funding levels to $80 million. This serves as an efficient use of moneys to serve as a bridge between our agricultural communities and our Nation's hungry. I will continue to work with my colleagues in the other body to try to get TEFAP funding back up to last year's levels.

Likewise, I will continue to work with my colleagues to reinstate some of these cuts in order to better reflect the fiscal needs of our rural communities and their dependent farming and ranching livelihood. Severe budget reductions in the name of deficit reduction is a goal worthy of debate; however, it must be done in a balanced and equitable, even-handed manner.

I look forward to working with our colleagues in achieving this goal. My ultimate statement on this measure will be my vote on the conference report.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to voice my support for the WIC Program, one of the most important programs we will vote on today. I heard from hundreds of residents of the 12th District in Michigan who want to ensure that all eligible women and children can participate in WIC. I agree with them that the benefits of funding WIC far outweigh the costs: Every dollar spent on the WIC Program saves between $1.77 and $3.13 in medical costs for mothers and infants in the first 60 days after birth, and even more after 60 days. A 1992 GAO study estimated that the $300 million in 1990 invested on WIC benefits for pregnant women would avert more than $1 billion in health-related costs over the next 18 years.

It is clear from this information that WIC has a remarkable record of success in providing nourishing food to the neediest women and children in our communities, but unfortunately has not been able to meet the demand for its services. We must work to meet the President's goal of fully funding the WIC Program so that we can serve all eligible applicants by 1996. Today's bill takes positive steps toward this goal by increasing funding for the deserving WIC Program even as we struggle to reduce the deficit.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Chairman, this Member would like to commend the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. SKEEN], the ranking member of the subcommittee for their hard work in bringing this bill to the floor.

Unfortunately Mr. Chairman, severe budgetary constraints and the rapid growth of mandatory programs—which now account for 80 percent of the total agricultural budget—have forced the committee to reduce discretionary spending by nearly $1.3 billion from fiscal year 1994. In addition, questionable discretionary spending priorities in this legislation, which include severe cuts to agricultural research, conservation, farm lending, and agricultural export promotion programs, threaten to seriously undermine the viability and competitiveness of an $18 billion trade surplus industry—the American agricultural industry.

For example, this legislation cuts U.S. agricultural export programs including the Export Enhancement Program, $150 million; Market Promotion Program, $10 million; foreign market development, $10 million; and the Food for Peace Program, Public Law 480 title I, $200 million.

Mr. Chairman, in 20 years the United States has lost approximately 20 percent of the world's wheat market, 30 percent of the world's soybean trade, and 15 percent of the world's feed grain market. Efforts are currently underway to implement a coordinated "truce" in agricultural subsidy wars through GATT, so American farmers can once again compete fairly with other agricultural producers. But this legislation hurts our farmers' ability to compete by unilaterally reducing agricultural export subsidies beyond our commitments under GATT. These cuts are unwise and jeopardize a substantial portion of an $18 billion trade surplus industry.

Additionally, Mr. Chairman, this legislation neglects important soil and water conservation programs at a time when farmers are facing a congressionally mandated deadline for conservation compliance by cutting funding for watershed and conservation programs from $242 to $65 million.

Mr. Chairman, last year's flooding washed away billions of tons of topsoil and destroyed miles of terraces, levees, and dams. If the U.S. agricultural industry intends to remain viable, we cannot force farmers to follow strict conservation compliance requirements while simultaneously failing to give them the necessary resources to protect our Nation's streams, waterways, and topsoil.

The budget constraints on the subcommittee also act to undermine efforts to significantly reform the current disaster and crop insurance programs and rewards the administration's reluctance to adopt innovative and reasonable science-based inspection requirements for the U.S. meat industry.

Mr. Chairman, year after year at my Agriculture Advisory Committee meetings, budget-conscious farmers strongly criticize the Federal Government's haphazard approach to crop insurance and agricultural risk mitigation. These farmers and agri-business leaders correctly assert that the nearly annual passage of ad-hoc disaster assistance has created a reverse incentive for producers to purchase their own crop insurance. According to the Congressional Research Service, last year's $1.1 billion disaster package for agriculture marked the 9th consecutive crop year for ad-hoc farm disaster assistance legislation.

Unfortunately, by underfunding the Federal crop insurance program by $217 million, this legislation greatly impedes the much-needed reform of the Federal crop insurance programs—as for example, the proposal offered by USDA Secretary Espy—and, therefore, thwarts efforts to move away from the costly ad-hoc approach to disaster assistance which annually exposes the American taxpayer to billions of dollars in supplemental disaster appropriations.

Similarly, the budget constraints on the subcommittee also apparently caused a cut of $103 million for the Food Safety Inspection Service's meat inspection systems while assuming that Congress will make up for the cuts by imposing user fees on meat processing facilities. By shifting the cost of this consumer-oriented inspection system directly to meat processors, this legislation eliminates the incentive for USDA to lower inspection costs and reward the administration's lethargy to adopt scientific risk-based inspection methods.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly opposed this approach and result, and I urge—once again—USDA to move toward greater science-based inspection techniques and technology. This is long overdue. The National Academy of Sciences and the General Accounting Office have long recognized that USDA's meat inspection programs are both expensive and not necessarily the best way to protect consumers from food borne illnesses. GAO said in its March report that the system—which was originally designed around the turn of the century "is hampered by inflexible requirements and relies on outdated, labor-intensive inspection methods." Unfortunately Mr. Chairman, this legislation simply rewards the "labor-intensive inspection methods" that GAO and the NAS have criticized.

Mr. Chairman, in light of these significant budget constraints, this Member is nevertheless grateful and pleased that this legislation includes $1 billion in loan authority for the Farmers Home Section 502 Middle Income Loan Guarantee Program. This is a housing program this Member proposed and pushed through his membership on the House Banking Committee. After a very successful 20 State demonstration program in 1991, the Section 502 Unsubsidized Loan Guarantee Program was expanded to all 50 States in 1992. The committee members are to be commended for recognizing the value of this program and providing funding levels more in line with the demand for the program from lenders, borrowers, and future homeowners.

Additionally, this Member is pleased that the committee has agreed to provide $425,000 in agricultural research funding for the Midwest Food Manufacturing Alliance. The Alliance is an association of 12 leading research universities whose purpose is to develop and facilitate the transfer of new food manufacturing and processing technologies.

Mr. Chairman, the future viability and competitiveness of the U.S. agricultural industry depends on its ability to adapt to increasing worldwide demands for U.S. exports of intermediate and consumer good exports. In order to meet these changing worldwide demands, agricultural research must also adapt to provide more emphasis on adding value to our basic farm commodities. The Midwest Advanced Food Manufacturing Alliance provides the necessary cooperative link between universities and industries for the development of competitive food manufacturing and processing technologies. This will, in turn, ensure that the U.S. agricultural industry remains competitive in an increasingly competitive global economy.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to speak on the Agriculture appropriations bill as a member of the subcommittee and as a representative of a rural State. As a member of the subcommittee, this bill is one of the hardest bills I have ever had to work on. How do you truly trim the budget deficit while providing citizens the programs and services which are needed. It is not an easy question and there is much of this bill that I do not agree with. But as an Appropriations member, I am challenged with reducing our deficit and this bill will do that.

On the good side, the bill makes major steps toward improving the health of our children. It increases funding for WIC to $3.47 billion. It protects the safety and health of women by ensuring that the FDA can implement the Mammography Quality Standards Act. I am pleased we have made the changes necessary to ensure housing for our rural residents under the 515 program.

But this bill is just a start and must be changed in conference. As a rural Representative I believe we must provide local communities with the means to meet Federal conservation mandates. And we must stop allowing the use of user fees on American businesses as a method to reduce the deficit.

This bill is just a beginning. An ugly duckling. Let's help it become a beautiful swan in conference.

Mr. BARCIA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4554, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, Food and Drug Administration, and related agencies for fiscal year 1995. I note that this bill that is very important to our farmers once again demonstrates agriculture's willingness to lead the way on budget cuts by coming in nearly $4.2 billion below the amount appropriated for fiscal 1994.

The is a bill that is largely controlled by entitlements. Only about one-fourth of the bill represents discretionary spending, and that is largely for research and conservation programs that help us maintain our productive and competitive edge in world markets.

I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. DURBIN from Illinois, for his assistance in pointing out in the committee's report the fact that the Department of Agriculture has failed to take advantage of lower priced varieties of dry beans in the Food for Peace Program. This has the consequence of failing to provide as much food as possible to needy nations while helping to move surplus commodities from our domestic markets, two of the very important purposes of the Public Law 480 program.

I have specifically proposed to him that we require the Department to utilize only those varieties of a commodity whose market price is 90 percent or less of the average market price for all varieties of that commodity, except in those cases where the offered varieties would be unacceptable to the recipient nation for cultural or dietary reasons. Hopefully the Department will heed the committee's report directive, or we will all have to take a more specific look at this issue next year.

Mr. Chairman, I am convinced that the Department has its own catch-22 in the Public Law 480 program. They say they order only the commodities that recipient nations request. But the representatives of the recipients claim that they only request what the Department says is available. We need, especially in tight budge times, to make a more frugal use of our resources, and concentrating on lower priced varieties will help us to achieve this goal.

I also want to thank the chairman for his understanding of the fact that the line item for improved fruit practices research in Michigan under the Cooperative State Research Service's budget for special grants will continue to include research funding for work done at the Saginaw Bean and Beet Research Farm. This was the intent of the Congress a year ago following conference on this appropriation bill, and it remains as its intent for fiscal 1995.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to thank a specific former employee of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for excellent assistance to Members of Congress throughout her career, and during my first year as a Member. Dreama Hinton has now gone on to a well-earned retirement, and she will be missed. She was most helpful early in 1993 when we were again dealing with a disaster program in Michigan. Her responses have always been as quick as possible, and any delay was only to insure the accuracy of her information. This diligence is appreciated and should be commended. I am sure that her colleagues at ASCS will continue on in her tradition. I would like to hold this office out as an example for other Congressional Affairs office throughout the executive branch. Prompt, accurate, honest, and often friendly answers. I can think of no better testimony to Dreama's career.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the fiscal 1995 Agriculture appropriations bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the remainder of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

This Act may be cited as the "Agricultural, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1995".

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN].

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 232, noes 146, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 255]

AYES—232

Abercrombie	Gonzalez	Pastor
Ackerman	Gordon	Payne (NJ)
Allard	Green	Pelosi
Andrews (ME)	Gutierrez	Penny
Andrews (NJ)	Hall (OH)	Peterson (FL)
Applegate	Hall (TX)	Peterson (MN)
Baesler	Hamburg	Pickett
Barca	Hamilton	Pomeroy
Barcia	Harman	Poshard
Barlow	Hefner	Price (NC)
Barrett (WI)	Hinchey	Quillen
Becerra	Hochbrueckner	Rahall
Beilenson	Holden	Reed
Berman	Hoyer	Richardson
Bevill	Hughes	Roemer
Bilbray	Hutto	Ros-Lehtinen
Bishop	Inslee	Rose
Bonior	Jacobs	Rowland
Borski	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Boucher	Johnson (SD)	Sabo
Browder	Johnson, E. B.	Sanders
Brown (FL)	Johnston	Sangmeister
Brown (OH)	Kanjorski	Sarpalius
Bryant	Kaptur	Sawyer
Byrne	Kennedy	Schenk
Cantwell	Kildee	Schroeder
Carr	Klein	Schumer
Chapman	Klink	Scott
Clayton	Kreidler	Serrano
Clement	LaFalce	Sharp
Clyburn	Lambert	Shepherd
Coleman	Lancaster	Sisisky
Collins (MI)	Lantos	Skaggs
Condit	LaRocco	Skeen
Conyers	Laughlin	Skelton
Cooper	Lehman	Slaughter
Coppersmith	Linder	Smith (IA)
Costello	Lloyd	Spratt
Cramer	Long	Stenholm
Danner	Lowey	Stokes
Darden	Maloney	Strickland
de la Garza	Mann	Studds
de Lugo (VI)	Manton	Stupak
Deal	Margolies-Mezvinsky	Sundquist
DeFazio	Markey	Swett
DeLauro	Martinez	Swift
Dellums	Mazzoli	Synar
Derrick	McCandless	Tanner
Deutsch	McCloskey	Tauzin
Diaz-Balart	McHale	Taylor (MS)
Dicks	McKinney	Tejeda
Dingell	Meehan	Thompson
Dixon	Meek	Thornton
Dooley	Menendez	Thurman
Durbin	Mfume	Torres
Edwards (CA)	Miller (CA)	Torricelli
Edwards (TX)	Mineta	Towns
Emerson	Minge	Traficant
Engel	Mink	Underwood (GU)
English	Moakley	Unsoeld
Eshoo	Mollohan	Valentine
Evans	Montgomery	Velazquez
Faleomavaega (AS)	Moran	Vento
Farr	Morella	Visclosky
Fazio	Murphy	Volkmer
Fields (LA)	Murtha	Walsh
Filner	Myers	Waters
Fingerhut	Nadler	Watt
Foglietta	Norton (DC)	Waxman
Ford (MI)	Oberstar	Wheat
Frank (MA)	Obey	Whitten
Frost	Olver	Williams
Furse	Ortiz	Wilson
Gejdenson	Orton	Wise
Gephardt	Owens	Woolsey
Geren	Pallone	Wyden
Glickman	Parker	Wynn
		Yates

NOES—146

Armey	Baker (LA)	Bartlett
Bachus (AL)	Ballenger	Barton
Baker (CA)	Barrett (NE)	Bateman

Bentley
Bereuter
Bilirakis
Bliley
Blute
Boehner
Bonilla
Bunning
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Canady
Castle
Clinger
Coble
Collins (GA)
Combest
Cox
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
DeLay
Dickey
Doolittle
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Everett
Ewing
Fawell
Fields (TX)
Fish
Fowler
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Gallegly
Gallo
Gekas
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Grandy
Greenwood
Gunderson
Hansen
Hastert
Hefley
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hoke
Horn
Huffington
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Istook
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kim
King
Kingston
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kyl
Lazio
Leach
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (KY)
Lightfoot
Lucas
Manzullo
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Meyers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Molinari
Moorhead
Nussle
Oxley
Packard
Paxon
Petri
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Ramstad
Ravenel
Regula
Roberts
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Roth
Roukema
Royce
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Sensenbrenner
Shays
Shuster
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Talent
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (WY)
Torkildsen
Upton
Vucanovich
Walker
Weldon
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—61

Andrews (TX)
Archer
Bacchus (FL)
Blackwell
Boehlert
Brewster
Brooks
Brown (CA)
Camp
Cardin
Clay
Collins (IL)
Coyne
Flake
Ford (TN)
Gibbons
Grams
Hancock
Hastings
Hayes
Herger
Hilliard
Hoagland
Houghton
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Kennelly
Kleczka
Kopetski
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Livingston
Machtley
Matsui
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McMillan
McNulty
Michel
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Payne (VA)
Pickle
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Rangel
Reynolds
Ridge
Romero-Barcelo (PR)
Rostenkowski
Rush
Santorum
Shaw
Slattery
Smith (OR)
Stark
Thomas (CA)
Tucker
Washington

□ 1212

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois for, with Mr. GRAMS against.

Mr. TUCKER for, with Mr. SMITH of Oregon against.

Mrs. BENTLEY changed her vote from "aye" to "no."

Ms. HARMAN changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to rise and report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GEPHARDT) having assumed the chair, Mr. SPRATT, 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. 4554) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill, as amended, do pass.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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. DELAY

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. DELAY. I am in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. DELAY moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 4554, to the Committee on Appropriations.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. DELAY was allowed to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I just take this 1 minute to say that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] and others have expressed concern over the Food Safety Inspection Service and its funding by user fees. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] and others have been talking to the chairman of the subcommittee and to the ranking member of the subcommittee.

I just wanted to ask the chairman, I think the chairman has said that he will look at the issue and consider it and try to take care of the problems of the Members that have expressed their concern. Is that true?

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

Mr. DELAY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] has raised some very valid concerns. I have also spoken to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STENHOLM], who is chairman of the subcommittee responsible for this reorganization. We will be working very closely with both of them and the Department to make certain that we maintain a high-level, cost-efficient meat and poultry inspection system.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 278, noes 127, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 256]

AYES—278

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barca
Barcia
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blackwell
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Browder
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Byrne
Calvert
Camp
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Chapman
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coleman
Collins (MI)
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Coppersmith
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Farr
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Glickman
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Harman
Hefner
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hochbrueckner
Holden
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Inslee
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klein
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lloyd
Long
Lowey
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Margolies-Mezvinsky
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McDade
McDermott
McHale
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Mfume
Miller (CA)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moran
Morella
Murtha
Myers
Nadler
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens

Packard	Sawyer	Tejeda
Pallone	Saxton	Thomas (CA)
Parker	Schenk	Thompson
Pastor	Schiff	Thornton
Payne (NJ)	Schroeder	Thurman
Payne (VA)	Schumer	Torres
Pelosi	Scott	Torricelli
Penny	Serrano	Towns
Peterson (FL)	Sharp	Traficant
Pickett	Shepherd	Unsoeld
Pickle	Sisisky	Valentine
Pomeroy	Skaggs	Velazquez
Poshard	Skeen	Vento
Price (NC)	Skelton	Visclosky
Quillen	Slaughter	Volkmer
Rahall	Smith (IA)	Vucanovich
Rangel	Smith (NJ)	Walsh
Ravenel	Smith (TX)	Waters
Reed	Spratt	Watt
Regula	Stark	Waxman
Richardson	Stenholm	Wheat
Roemer	Stokes	Whitten
Rogers	Strickland	Williams
Rose	Studds	Wilson
Rostenkowski	Stupak	Wise
Rowland	Swett	Woolsey
Roybal-Allard	Swift	Wyden
Sabo	Synar	Wynn
Sanders	Tanner	Yates
Sangmeister	Tauzin	Young (AK)
Sarpalius	Taylor (MS)	Young (FL)

NOES—127

Allard	Gillmor	Miller (FL)
Archer	Gilman	Molinari
Armey	Gingrich	Moorhead
Bachus (AL)	Goodlatte	Nussle
Baker (CA)	Goodling	Oxley
Ballenger	Goss	Paxon
Barrett (NE)	Grandy	Peterson (MN)
Bartlett	Greenwood	Petri
Bateman	Gunderson	Pombo
Bliley	Hancock	Porter
Blute	Hansen	Portman
Boehner	Hastert	Ramstad
Burton	Hefley	Roberts
Buyer	Herger	Rohrabacher
Callahan	Hobson	Ros-Lehtinen
Canady	Hoekstra	Roth
Castle	Hoke	Roukema
Clinger	Huffington	Royce
Coble	Hutchinson	Santorum
Collins (GA)	Hyde	Schaefer
Combest	Inglis	Sensenbrenner
Cox	Inhofe	Shaw
Crane	Istook	Shays
Crapo	Jacobs	Shuster
Cunningham	Johnson, Sam	Smith (MI)
DeLay	Kasich	Snowe
Dickey	Kim	Solomon
Doolittle	King	Spence
Dornan	Kingston	Stearns
Dreier	Klug	Stump
Duncan	Knollenberg	Sundquist
Dunn	Kyl	Talent
Ehlers	Lazio	Taylor (NC)
Emerson	Levy	Thomas (WY)
Everett	Lewis (KY)	Torkildsen
Ewing	Lucas	Upton
Fawell	Manzullo	Walker
Fields (TX)	McCollum	Weldon
Fish	McHugh	Wolf
Fowler	McInnis	Zeliff
Franks (NJ)	McKeon	Zimmer
Gallo	Meyers	
Gilchrest	Mica	

NOT VOTING—29

Bacchus (FL)	Hayes	Pryce (OH)
Boehlert	Hilliard	Quinn
Brooks	Klink	Reynolds
Brown (CA)	Lipinski	Ridge
Bunning	Livingston	Rush
Clay	Machtley	Slattery
Collins (IL)	McCurdy	Smith (OR)
Flake	McMillan	Tucker
Grams	Michel	Washington
Hastings	Murphy	

□ 1232

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Brooks for, with Mr. Bunning against.

Mrs. Collins of Illinois for, with Mr. Grams against.

Mr. Tucker for, with Mr. Quinn against.

Mr. Washington for, with Mr. Smith of Oregon against.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE A PRIVILEGED REPORT ON A BILL PROVIDING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight tonight, June 17, 1994, to file a privileged report to accompany a bill providing appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for fiscal year 1995, and for other purposes.

Mr. REGULA reserved all points of order on the bill.

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

There was no objection.

MAKING IN ORDER ON OR AFTER JUNE 21, 1994, CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4568, DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1994

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on June 21, 1994, or any day thereafter, any rule of the House to the contrary notwithstanding, to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4568) making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes; that the bill be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations; and that the previous question be considered as ordered to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, on the vote just taken on the motion to rise, we had some miscommunications problems. Let me explain to the best of my knowledge what happened.

The Committee on Ways and Means, as all of you know, are involved in marking up a very controversial but a very important bill. When the vote to rise occurred, I called over here to ask the vote to be delayed until we could finish that voting process.

I received word back that the vote would be delayed until we had completed that voting process.

Unfortunately, the vote was not delayed, and 38 members of the Committee on Ways and Means who were trying to do their job were unable to vote on that vote. I do not know whether it would have affected the outcome of the rising or not, but it being Friday, it probably would not have.

I want to have that explanation entered into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I apologize to all my members of the Committee on Ways and Means who missed that vote because of what I said, and I would ask unanimous consent that all members of the Committee on Ways and Means who may wish to may have 5 legislative days to insert anything in the RECORD that they want to on this subject matter.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, following up on what our chairman said, we were assured as we deliberated in the Committee on Ways and Means across the street in the Longworth Building that the vote would be held open on the floor so that we would be able to make that vote. We were in the process of actually voting on an extremely important amendment to health care. With the assurance that we would have time to walk across the street and to vote before the gavel went down and closed the vote, we continued to be there. We had to be there, as far as I was concerned, because it was a vote on my amendment that I had to be there for.

Mr. Speaker, had I been on the floor of the House at the time that vote had been taken, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, I was told by the people who are supposed to be running this place that we could continue our work in committee and that I would be able to come and vote on the floor on the motion that was in front of us. Given the confusion in running the place, I missed the vote.

Mr. Speaker, had I been here, I would have voted "no."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, I too am a member of the Committee on Ways and Means and suffered the same consequences of a miscommunication.

Mr. Speaker, had I been here, I would have voted "no" on the motion to rise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I too was in the Committee on Ways and Means markup hearing and, had I been on the floor, I would have voted "no" on the motion to rise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I too was in the Committee on Ways and Means meeting and would have voted "no" on the motion to rise, had I been present.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. JOHNSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I too was in the Committee on Ways and Means meeting and would have voted "no" on the motion to rise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I also am on the Committee on Ways and Means. If I had been here, I would have voted "no" on the motion to rise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. McCRERY. Mr. Speaker, likewise I was in the Committee on Ways and Means and was under the impression the vote was being held until we got to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, had I known the vote was not being held, I certainly would have come over and cast my vote "no" on the motion to rise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KOPETSKI. Today, as others have stated, I am on the Committee on Ways and means and on Friday, June 17, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 255, the vote on the motion to rise.

□ 1240

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I also was at the meeting of the Committee on Ways and Means, and, if I had had the opportunity to vote, I would have voted "no" on the motion to rise.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, today I missed rollcall vote No. 255, the motion to rise and report on H.R. 4554, the Agriculture appropriations for fiscal year 1995.

Due to a miscommunication between the floor and the Ways and Means Committee leadership, I missed that vote along with 37 other members of the Ways and Means Committee.

Had I been able, I would have voted "no" on the motion to rise, to allow Mr. ROHRABACHER to debate his amendment to the Agriculture appropriations bill.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, due to official business, I was not available for rollcall Nos. 254, 255, and 256.

Had I been present I would have voted "nay" on No. 254; "aye" on No. 255; and "aye" on No. 256.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1-minute for the purpose of ascertaining the schedule for next week.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], the acting majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we will finish here shortly, and on Monday there will be no session, and on Tuesday, June 21, and the balance of the week, we will consider the supplemental appropriation for the Department of Housing and Urban Development which was passed out of the Committee on Appropriations today. We will also consider the Independent Counsel Reauthorization Act conference report, subject, of course, to a rule. We might possibly, assuming the time is available, continue with the consideration of the California Desert Protection Act. We will then have three appropriations bills which have been reported out of the committee, all subject to rules except for the HHS bill on which there will not be a rule, I understand, Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill, the Interior and related agencies bill, and, as I said, Labor HHS and Education appropriations bill.

The last item on our calendar at this point in time will be the Anti-Redlining In Insurance Disclosure Act, also subject to a rule. In addition there may be other motions to go to conference. We expect to adjourn on Friday.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I just have a couple of questions, if I may, of the gentleman.

Do we expect conferences reports to come back for possible votes next week?

Mr. HOYER. There are obviously conferences going on, and we are not positive that they will report back, but, if they did, that would be a possibility.

Mr. WALKER. Does the gentleman have any idea on what days we may schedule some of these appropriation bills? Is there a preliminary schedule in terms of when the various appropriation bills are likely to arrive? Can we assume that the supplemental appropriations will possibly be on Tuesday and will be the first order of business?

Mr. HOYER. Let me first go to the gentleman's question on the appropriation bills. This is the probability. Obviously it is subject to change. But probability is that on Wednesday Commerce, Justice, State will be on the floor, Interior and related agencies on Thursday, and then the Labor HHS bill on the floor on Friday.

Mr. WALKER. And on Tuesday the supplemental, and we would anticipate no votes before any particular time?

Mr. HOYER. One or two o'clock. The earliest, we think, would be by one o'clock.

Mr. WALKER. There are a couple of events that are going to involve fairly large numbers of Members next week. The White House is having a picnic. Can we assume that the House is planning to adjourn in time to take care of that eventuality?

Mr. HOYER. There are events of interest to both sides of the aisle, and, to the extent we possibly can, we want to accommodate those that we are going to try to accommodate.

Mr. WALKER. I think the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] has a question.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. The question that I would like to ask of my friend is:

In 1992, Mr. Speaker, by an overwhelming majority at the end of the 102d Congress we established the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. It was put into place for 1 year, and in November 1993 we reported out a bill, H.R. 3801, and there was an indication that we were going to consider that package, H.R. 3801, which is charged with the responsibility of reforming the institution, with the generous rule that would allow for the provisions that were considered in our committee, to be voted on here on the House floor, and I wondered if my friend might give me some indication as to when we can expect the full package, H.R. 3801, which was reported out of our committee, to get to the House floor here.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] for his question.

While I cannot give the gentleman the specific answer to his question, I can tell him that the Speaker has met with, and the gentleman serves on, the Committee on Rules which is considering the package, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. BEILENSON] who, I understand, chairs the task force considering it, but the Speaker has met with both the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr.

HAMILTON], the gentleman's fellow chair on that task force, with the specific objective of trying to come up with that answer and, in as timely a fashion as possible, try to bring that to the floor.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I just want to say that we have been waiting for a long period of time. It was reported out last November, and early indications were that we were going to finally have an opportunity to vote on the reform question in November of last year, then in the early spring of this year, and then late spring of this year, and here we are now, based on the way this beautiful Maryland-Virginia-Washington, DC weather is, we are well into the summer, and it seems to me that this would be a timely opportunity for us to finally bring the reform package to the floor.

I would simply like to say, as I have to my counterpart, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and my colleagues on the Committee on Rules, that I hope we can move it here in an expeditious manner.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we appreciate the gentleman's concern, and the fact is that this has been under consideration. This is obviously a major piece of legislation, as the gentleman knows. It is under consideration of the Committee on Rules. The Committee on Rules' subcommittee has been considering it, and, as I said and will repeat, the Speaker wants to see this matter moved as quickly as possible, has talked to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] just this week with the objective of getting this matter to——

Mr. DREIER. I would just like to inquire if there is an indication as to whether or not we will have the package in toto as it was reported out of the joint committee at the end of last year.

Mr. HOYER. I have not talked to the Speaker since he has talked to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and I do not have that information.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, so the gentleman from Maryland might understand some of our concern, we read in Roll Call earlier this week that there is some concern that the August recess may have to be delayed because of the press of business on health care and other items, and there has been little movement on the congressional reform bill. It sounds as though we are beginning to run out of time for major legislation, and some of us who did spend a year out of our lives working pretty hard on the congressional reform issue would like to think that this is going to be something that is going to be prioritized and brought to the floor within what is becoming a relatively tight schedule.

Mr. HOYER. I think the leadership on this side appreciates that view and has every intention of pursuing it.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY, JUNE 21, 1994

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday next.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

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

There was no objection.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES TO FILE REPORT ON H.R. 2238, FEDERAL ACQUISITION IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1994

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services have until midnight tonight to file the report on the bill H.R. 2238, the Federal Acquisition Improvement Act of 1994.

This request has been cleared with the minority side.

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

There was no objection.

HONORING JAMES NORMAN HALL FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE UNITED STATES AND THE SOUTH PACIFIC

Mrs. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service by discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 215) honoring James Norman Hall and recognizing his outstanding contributions to the United States and the South Pacific, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under my reservation I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 215.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] who is the chief sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 215.

□ 1250

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Virginia [Mrs. BYRNE], and my distinguished colleague and friend from New York [Mr. GILMAN], as well as the distinguished Members from the Iowa delegation, Congressmen JIM LEACH, JIM LIGHTFOOT, NEAL SMITH, FRED GRANDY, and JIM NUSSLE, for their assistance in the passage of this legislation.

I would also like to recognize the efforts of certain staff—including Denise Wilson of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, Thomas Dawson, Bill Tate, Christine Smith, Steve Greiner and Kathleen Black with Members' offices, and Enere H. Levi and Martin Yerick of my staff—that worked long and hard for the adoption of this measure. I thank them for their help.

I rise today—along with my esteemed colleagues from Iowa and the over 230 Members of this great institution who are cosponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 215—to urge adoption of this measure, which provides a long overdue tribute to James Norman Hall, a son of the great State of Iowa and an outstanding American known throughout the world as an author and a true warrior.

James Norman Hall—adventurer, soldier, ace pilot, author, essayist, and poet—was a great man marked by contrasting qualities and eclectic tastes. While fighting axis forces of oppression during World War I, Hall was the consummate, steely-eyed warrior who distinguished himself in battle; yet, in peacetime, James Michener wrote this sensitive man was "the most loved American who ever came to the tropics. He had a gentle humor and abiding concern for people and a ready franc for anyone in need."

James Norman Hall was born in the Iowa farmtown of Colfax, in the district of our colleague, the Honorable. NEAL SMITH. Hall lived the life of a typical farm boy, with a taste for Huckleberry Finn adventures. Upon graduating from Colfax High School, Hall was accepted to Grinnell College. There, James Norman Hall excelled in academics while working his way through school. He majored in the fields of literature and music. Graduating as a Phi Beta Kappa, Hall, even then, was a prolific writer, producing a good number of poems and essays.

In the summer of 1914, after experiencing frustration and rejection while trying to establish a writing career in Boston, James Norman Hall traveled to

England for a break. In August of that fateful year, World War I erupted. Although the United States had not yet entered the conflict and Americans were not accepted for service, Hall's commitment to freedom and democracy would not be deterred. In order to enlist, Hall posed as a Canadian to join Lord Kitchener's volunteers with the 9th Royal Fusileers.

James Norman Hall fought alongside British forces as a foot soldier in the worst of the early, deadly trench wars. During the battle of Loos, in particular, casualties were tremendously high. Hall was one of few in his company to survive the battle. Later, Hall received word that his father was dying in Iowa. Upon requesting leave for a brief visit, it was discovered he was not Canadian. Against his will, Hall was honorably discharged.

Shortly after his return to the United States, James Norman Hall continued efforts to support the allied cause. Hall wrote "Kitchener's Mob" a pro-Allied book that became very successful. Many feel that the work strongly influenced public opinion, leading to America's eventual entry into World War I.

As a fledgling writer for the Atlantic Monthly and Boston Globe, James Norman Hall was sent back to Europe to cover the formation of an American pursuit squadron in the French Air Service. Rather than simply report, however, the adventurous Hall yearned to enter battle again. Hall not only wrote of the exploits of the squadron but joined it, learning to fly as a pilot with the Escadrille Lafayette N-124. During this time, Hall started another book, "High Adventure," which became very popular.

It was not long before James Norman Hall established his prowess in the air over France. His daring and courageous feats in dogfights against German Fokkers during WWI became legend. As an ace pilot, James Norman Hall was also shot down and severely wounded. Returning from his injuries to fly again, Hall became a celebrated hero of France. In gratitude, the French Government awarded James Norman Hall France's highest medals for bravery, including the Legion d'Honneur, Medaille Militaire, and the Croix De Guerre with five palms.

With America's entry into WWI, James Norman Hall was made a captain in the U.S. Army Air Service and transferred to the 94th "Hat in the Ring" squadron. While serving as wing commander, Hall also acted as mentor for a rookie destined for greatness, then-Lt. Eddie Rickenbacker. Rickenbacker's first kill was under the guidance of Captain Hall. In memoirs of his famed career as a fighter pilot, Rickenbacker wrote that Capt. Jimmy Hall was idolized by the American pilots and that Hall served as an inspiration for them all in their darkest hour.

Captain Hall's legendary exploits and gallantry in battle earned him the U.S. Distinguished Service Cross, which was awarded personally to Hall by General Pershing.

After the destructiveness and brutality of WWI, James Norman Hall sought serenity and peace to heal, away from the "mess and muddle" of western civilization. His search ended in the South Pacific, where in 1920 he moved to the remote Isle of Tahiti. A most humble and self-effacing man, James Norman Hall locked away his war medals and hero's decorations, mentioning them to no one. Hall's life was purposely low-key; he loathed publicity and avoided the limelight.

Traveling extensively throughout the society islands and the South Pacific, James Norman Hall came to know the people intimately and to love them. Hall's gentleness and kindness was returned many-fold, as he was widely revered, respected, and loved by the people of the Pacific.

In 1925 Hall married Sarah Teraireia Winchester, the Tahitian daughter of an English sea captain. They had two children, Nancy and Conrad, for whom Hall was a devoted and adoring father. The daughter, Nancy, is married to Nicholas G. Rutgers, whose family established Rutgers University in New Jersey. Hall's son, Conrad, is an Oscar award-winning cinematographer for his work on "Butch Cassidy and the Sundance Kid" and resides in Hollywood.

Over three decades until his death in 1951, James Norman Hall lived in Arue, Tahiti, and wrote extensively in his library. With the support of his wife and family, Hall authored a prodigious number of books, 28 in his career, not including his numerous essays and poems.

James Norman Hall's most famous works, however, were those that enriched the world's understanding of the people of Tahiti and the South Pacific. With friend and co-author, Charles Nordhoff, Hall collaborated to write "Mutiny on the Bounty," "Pitcairn's Island," "Hurricane" and "The Forgotten One." In assessing Hall's career, James Michener notes that these masterpieces have come to epitomize the tropics and that they constitute some of the greatest books ever written on the Pacific. Many of James Norman Hall's works, in particular "Mutiny on the Bounty," have been immortalized on the silver screen.

In July 1951, James Norman Hall died in Arue, Tahiti, and was buried on a hill overlooking his home and beloved library. Hall's death was greatly mourned in the south seas, prompting James Michener to write, "When he died, on every island in the Pacific where even no man could read, there was sorrow." Upon sorting through Hall's belongings, his war decorations were finally discovered. It was only then that the people of Tahiti and the Pacific Islands learned that in their midst had lived a true war hero.

The home and library of James Norman Hall in Arue, Tahiti, have been restored as a museum to honor the life of this great American.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to join me in adopting the resolution before us, which recognizes James Norman Hall and his outstanding contributions to our Nation, France, Tahiti, and the South Pacific, including James Norman Hall's extraordinary service rendered in wartime for the defense of freedom and liberty, his exceptional achievements in the literary field, and his lifework that has enriched the world's understanding of the people of the South Pacific.

Mr. Speaker, upon passage of this piece of legislation, it would be my sincere hope that the President of the United States, through his personal representative, present this resolution to the President of Tahiti Nui, His Excellency the Honorable Gaston Flosse of French Polynesia, where it may be publicly displayed at the James Norman Hall Museum in Tahiti.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of a more appropriate manner for the people and Government of the United States to express their deep sense of gratitude and enduring appreciation for the contributions and achievements of James Norman Hall, a great American and a distinguished son of the State of Iowa.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for passage of this resolution.

[From the New York Times Book Review, Oct. 19, 1952]

A GENTLEMAN LOST IN A MODERN WORLD

(By James Michener)

The most loved American who ever came to the tropics was James Norman Hall, the Iowa small-town boy who arrived in Tahiti in 1920. He had a gentle humor, an abiding concern for people, and a ready franc for anyone in need. When he was working on a novel Chinese merchants, American beachcombers and broken-down European counts would report daily to the local bars on Jimmy's progress, certain thereby to cadge a free drink. When he returned to Tahiti from Hollywood or from a visit to Ellery Sedgwick in Boston children would meet him at the dock with flowers. He enjoyed a place in island society such as few writers have even known in any society. When he died, on every island in the Pacific where even no man could read, there was sorrow.

Many of us, allured by this romantic figure of the writer deified during his life, have overlooked the fact that Hall was a prodigious worker (twenty-eight books in thirty-six years) and that his interests covered practically the entire field of writing. His books include propaganda to influence America's entry into World War I, "Kitchener's Mob" (1916); factual reporting, "History of the Lafayette Flying Corps" (1920); legend, "The Far Lands" (1950); biography, the superb Frisbie essay in "The Forgotten One" (1952); hilarious local color, "No More Gas" (1940); and excellent historical romance, the "Bounty" trilogy (1932-34).

Contrarily, he thought of himself primarily as a poet, but his most successful work in this field was his outrageous and gay literary hoax, "O, Millersville!" which he

published in 1940 as the outpourings of a precocious Iowa schoolgirl.

Hall may one day be remembered as the last of the great essayists, for he published several books like "Faery Lands of the South Seas" (1921), which contained highly polished examples of this now-outmoded form. More likely his reputation will rest on his tales of tropical adventure, but his position among his peers is yet to be decided. Stevenson commanded a more gracile pen, Rupert Brooke was a greater poet, Maugham a finer master of plot, Pierre Loti a lusher romanticist. Louis Becke knew far more about the Pacific, Conrad had a deeper sense of the mysterious, and Melville a greater sense of the tragedy of the sea.

Yet Hall accomplished something that none of his distinguished predecessors attained. He wrote, or helped to write, those fortunate masterpieces which epitomize the tropics. I know of no more skillful Pacific romance than "The Hurricane." None of Jack London's South Sea stories equal Hall's cruel and bitter "The Forgotten One." Surely nothing Stevenson accomplished in Samoa approaches the "Bounty" series. And I know an occasional poem, or part of a poem, in which Hall equals Brooke's best Pacific lyrics. Not the greatest man to have written about the Pacific, he nevertheless wrote some of the greatest books.

His last work was this present autobiography. It is a curious book and he would be amazed to know that it can be read as tragedy. That was not his intention, for he devotes a major portion to the golden days he spent in Iowa, sharing with us his boyhood apostrophe to the grubby stream that wandered near his home:

Oh, loverly River! Gentle Skunk!
Beneath this shining pool was sunk
The body of a Colfax boy!
How could the stream we love destroy
The life of little Willie King
And leave his parents sorrowing?
And throw his body on the ground
Nearly a mile from where he drowned?

He recalls his experiences while waiting table in a house of prostitution, acting as social worker in the slums of Boston, serving as a volunteer with the British Expeditionary Force in France, and flying with Eddie Rickenbacker over Germany. He became an ace, knocking down five German planes, and he met with his future collaborator, Charles Nordhoff, the novelist and travel writer, of whom he says, "* * * My first impression was unfavorable. He shook hands with me in a coldly punctilious manner and I was thinking: 'Lord! How am I to work with this man?'"

Like Pierre Loti before him, Hall vacillated between Tahiti and Iceland, each of which he immediately appreciated. "I loved Iceland from the moment I set foot in the country, and had it been possible I would have been commuting between Iceland and the Southern Seas these past thirty years."

Finally, on Page 301, he settles down in Tahiti (1923) and the reader takes a deep breath, prepared to discover what it was in the tropics that captivated men like Hall and Conrad or how two such dissimilar writers as he and Nordhoff happened to become collaborators.

The tragedy is that when he reached the important days in Tahiti time was running out for Jimmy Hall, He lived to complete only two chapters, an inconclusive one on a famous hotel and a haunting verbatim conversation with Nordhoff. The mysteries of the South Seas he does not touch upon and we are deprived of the understanding we sought. "All of my roots are still in America, in the prairie country of the Middle West. I realize now that it is useless trying to grub them up to transplant on this little island. They won't come up."

Hall can be understood only as an eighteenth-century English gentleman. Spiritually he was close to that perfect man, Capt. James Cook; artistically he held much in common with Goldsmith and Addison. He cultivated innumerable eighteenth-century reticences. "'We are waiting on table in a bawdy house,' my friend said with a faint wry smile, His term was the one more commonly use in Iowa for such places, but I use 'bawdy' because it seems, somehow, more refined." Or again, "I dislike change in manners, customs and habits of thought as much as I do in material aspects."

In his autobiography Hall refers only once, and then most casually, to Sarah Winchester, the wonderfully vivacious Tahitian-English girl he married. Their love story is one of the most glowing in this century, but Hall could not bring himself even to mention it, though his assembled family begged him to.

While writing his last novel Hall was faced by his determined and beautiful 18-year-old daughter who said. "you must explain to the reader that your hero and heroine are actually in love." "That has no place in books," he insisted. "Father! You don't know what's in modern books. Sit still and listen!" She read him a chapter from a recent book and when she finished Hall blushed deeply and asked, "Did James Michener write that * * * in a book?" Nancy replied that she could have read from Mailer, "or some of the others who really get down to cases," and Hall cried, "They ought to be ashamed of themselves! All of them!" So Nancy outlined the missing chapters, but when Hall heard what was needed he gulped, blushed and said, "Well, if that's what the public demands. * * *"

Hall's truncated biography is good reading. It tells of a distinguished gentleman lost in a modern world, of an Iowa boy who perpetually longed to return home: "Iowa, for all the years I have been away from it, has always been, and still is, home to me."

The book's omissions are partly repaired in an excellent concluding chapter by Edward Weeks, Hall's editor. He explains how Nordhoff and Hall worked and he shares with the reader a remarkable letter sent him from Tahiti after Hall's funeral. "When I look down upon that cushion upon which are pinned his medals and decorations from the leading governments of the world I for the first time realize that we had living amongst us a great man. * * * In our midst dwelt a hero."

[From the Profile magazine]

JAMES NORMAN HALL

(By Barbara Jo Elkington)

Two hundred years ago this year, the famous *Bounty* salied out of Matavai Bay, Tahiti, bound for Jamaica with its load of breadfruit plants. Mutiny was waiting. Fifty-seven years ago, James Norman Hall and Charles Nordhoff immortalized this true tale in their novel *Mutiny on the Bounty*, thereby gaining immortality for themselves, Fletcher Christian, and Captain Bligh. Most of us remember either Clark Gable and Charles Laughton or Marlon Brando and Trevor Howard, depending on our ages and the movie versions we saw. Unfortunately, not as many of us remember Nordhoff or Hall very well.

James Norman Hall, like many Pacific writers, is under-appreciated and vastly more readable and talented than his present fame merits. Even those of us who claim some enchanted island in the Pacific as home don't know as much as we should about Hall and other writers who by birth or choice made the Pacific more than the stereotyped paradise of paper back novels. Hall, in addition to being the co-author with Nordhoff of *Mutiny on the Bounty*, *Men Against the Sea*, and *Pitcairn's Island*, wrote some 16 major works on his own, as well as numerous essays and poems, lyrics for a number of songs, and several plays. Almost all his writing relies on the Pacific, war, or the sea for locale, and much is historically based and factually accurate. Two of Hall's basic themes, according to Louise Hanson, are "that the twentieth century is vulgar and moves too fast, and that man is essentially good." Hanson, a research specialist at the University of Pittsburgh, goes on to say: "James Norman Hall hardly fulfills the stereotype of a betel-nut chewing beachcomber on a tropical island. * * * What he sought in Polynesia was a certain simplicity of life impossible to find in the West. His customs and habits, however, remained American down to the fixed daily routine, book-lined study and shined shoes. * * * As an unregenerate optimist and idealist, he was out of place in the twentieth-century world. * * *"

An optimist out of place in a pessimistic century seems to be the capsule definition of Hall. What kind of life did he lead to bring this about? He left the Iowa town where he grew up, became a flying ace in World War I, escaped to a South Seas island, and became a writer famous in his own time. He traveled the world, married happily, and, to quote James Michener, was "the most loved American who ever came to the tropics. He had a gentle humor, an abiding concern for people and a ready franc for anyone in need. * * * When he died, on every island in the Pacific, even where no man could read, there was sorrow."

This is a true and a complimentary epitaph. Hall died in 1951. His son-in-law's choice for his grave marker in Tahiti came from an early Hall poem. Nicholas G. Rutgers, Jr., changed barnyard to hillside resulting in a suitable sentiment:

Look to the northward stranger.
Just over the hillside there.
Have you in your travels seen
A land more passing fair (Briand 376).

Though Hall had written this during his Iowa childhood, it predicts his life and his successful search he undertook for that land more fair.

His search began after his graduation from Grinnell College in Iowa where he was a Phi Beta Kappa. He also earned his Master's degree there in 1922 after taking some classes at Harvard and the University of Iowa. In 1950 he was awarded an honorary Ph.D.

During the early part of his search, while in Paris on leave from his duties as a volunteer American airman with the Escadrille Lafayette, Hall first encountered the tale of the *Bounty*. Pausing at Brentano's bookstore on the Champs Elysees, he picked up a reprint of a history, *The Mutiny of the Bounty*, by Sir John Barrow in 1831. During his boyhood Hall had read something of British naval history and the names Bligh, Christian, and Pitcairn's awakened vague memories. In 1917 he read about "Otaheite" and made a promise to himself that someday he would wander among those fabled isles "under the wind."

In Tahiti in 1929 when Nordhoff and Hall were searching for a likely subject to provide

the base for a novel, Hall came across Barrow's book again and rushed to Nordhoff "breathless with enthusiasm." Biographer Paul Briand tells the story:

"Have you ever heard of the Bounty mutiny?" Hall cried out. "Of course." Nordhoff calmly replied. "Who hasn't, who knows anything about the South Seas?"

"Well, what about that for a story?" Hall suggested eagerly * * *

"Maybe we've got something there! * * * What a story! What a story!" said Nordhoff (316–317).

Indeed it was something. Ellery Sedgewick of *Atlantic Monthly* and their editor Edward Weeks assisted in research, while the Bishop Museum and the British Museum in London supplied background material. A retired British Commander, E.C. Tufnell, RN, provided copies of hundreds of historical documents and even a scale model of the *Bounty*.

Over a period of five years Hall and Nordhoff pondered, read related materials, and wrote, resulting in the three volumes detailing the mutiny, Bligh's sea voyage in an open boat, and Christian's settlement on Pitcairn's Island. Weeks declared he was impressed with the manuscript for the first book which took three years of effort: "It was a book of exceptional beauty and one which drew a striking contrast between the golden age of Polynesia and the tough brutality of man to man which existed aboard Bligh's ship." (Briand 318)

The authors worked as a team. Nordhoff provided the narrative push, keeping the action moving. Hall paused to describe, to wonder, and his passages furnished insights and commentary on Polynesian life, which Hall firmly believed had suffered under the impact of European and American contacts as the ending of *Mutiny on the Bounty* where Captain Byam returns to Tahiti after twenty years attests:

"A few people were discernible along the beach, watching us apathetically but they were pitifully few beside the throngs of former days, and where once the thatched roofs of their dwellings had been clustered thick under the trees, there was scarcely a house to be seen. Even the trees themselves had a withered, yellow look, for as I was to learn, the victorious party had hacked and girdled nearly every breadfruit in Matavai." (Nordhoff and Hall 370) Invasion, war and pestilence had changed forever the lives of the people.

Hall, who traveled widely in the Society Islands, knew and loved the people. In 1925 he married Sarah Teraireia Winchester, the lovely part-Tahitian daughter of an English sea captain. She made a home for him and provided a reason for the determination and focus he needed in his writing. They had two children, a son Conrad Lafcadio (named for writers Joseph Conrad and Lafcadio Hearn), and a daughter Nancy Ella. Hall was a devoted father and found great pleasure in his children.

In researching *Bounty* materials, Hall read widely in English eighteenth century literature which influenced his own style and content. A novel he wrote in 1940, *Dr. Dogbody's Leg*, proved to be a lively collection of nine salty tales cataloging the many ways the charming British ship's doctor lost his left leg. Another 1940 novel he co-authored, *No More Gas*, told of the Tuttles, a large and hospitable Tahitian clan, always out of gas for boat or truck, but never out of food or love for fellow man.

All his life Hall fancied himself a poet, but, interestingly, his biggest poetic hit was a hoax. In 1941, he created a poetess, Fern Gravel, who with his help "authored" fifty-eight versus collected under the title *Oh Millersville!* Fern was supposedly a nine-year-old resident of Millersville, Iowa, who had an observant eye and a sharply barbed pen, resulting in verses which enchanted the critics who didn't discover until 1946 that Hall had fooled them all.

Essays written by Hall have proved to be one of his strongest literary contributions. A collection titled *The Forgotten One* reveals Hall's eye for detail and his deep sense of humanity.

Before his death, Hall visited his daughter, Nancy, and her husband, Nicholas G. Rutgers, Jr., in their Lanikai home on Oahu. The Rutgerses still make Hawaii their home for a part of each year, living in Kamuela on the Big Island and doing much to maintain important papers and documents Hall collected. Conrad, an Oscar-award winning cinematographer, lives in Hollywood and maintains a home in Tahiti.

Were he alive today, Hall might read the work of authors like O. A. Bushnell of Hawaii whose marvelously rich prose in such books as *Molokai* and *Kaaawa* tells of the impact of the outside world on the culture of Hawaii, creating a cry from the heart. Witi Ihimaera of New Zealand, author of *Ponomu Ponomu* and *Tangi* would interest Hall because of his ability to put on paper the Maori heart. Albert Wendt of Samoa, author of *Leaves of the Banyan Tree* and *Sons for the Return Home*, would doubtless find Hall a helpful friend and critic. James Norman Hall was a writer who read constantly. Perhaps we should follow that suggestion, enriching our lives by reading not only Hall's works but find other delightful or challenging pieces of Pacific literature to add to our libraries.

THE WORLD OF JAMES NORMAN HALL

(By Edward H. Joesting)

The south pacific during the days of James Norman Hall was a romantic spot which would have fascinated any author. To Nancy Hall Rutgers, daughter of the late James Normal Hall, life among the South Sea islands before World War II almost seems like an unreality. Although Nancy now lives at Lanikai with her husband, Nick, and their two small boys, Tahiti for many years was her home.

Nancy's father traveled to Tahiti some thirty years ago. At that time Hall was practically an unknown writer who had just returned from World War II. He also was only a few years away from the family farm in Iowa. Before many years had gone by this quiet unknown man had become a famous writer. Mutiny on the Bounty, Pitcairn's Island and The Hurricane became household words and with them the names of the co-authors, James Norman Hall and Charles Nordhoff.

To Hall, by nature a sensitive man, World War I had been a doubly terrible experience. Never fearing solitude, Hall sought it even more after going through two years of trench warfare with the British and then flying many combat missions with the Lafayette Flying Corps. Although Eddie Rickenbacker marveled at Hall's coolness in action, at the war's end the aspiring young writer more than ever longed for some refuge away from modern civilization. Once Hall had seen the South Pacific he knew that it was exactly what he had been searching for. Here was the answer to his prayers. Here was solitude, beauty and stimulation.

Certainly one of the most stimulating things about the South Seas in 1920 was the odd collection of individualists who seemed to be drawn to that part of the world. Many authors have been intrigued with these characters. Somerset Maugham, Joseph Conrad and from the World War II years, James Michener, have all written about them. These individualists who were lured to the South Seas, hoping to find there a primitive paradise, interested hall just as much as they interested the writers before him.

The man who became Hall's father-in-law was a good example of the staunchest of these individualists. His name was Joseph Winchester and at an early age he had run away from his home in England to seek adventure in the South Seas. And there was a great plenty of adventure to satisfy his longings. Soon Captain Winchester had set himself up as a sailor-merchant and had acquired two sailing schooners to trade among the South Sea Islands.

It was Captain Winchester who carried Gauguin, the famous French painter, to many of the Marquesas Islands as a passenger on his schooners. Gauguin was unable to pay Winchester in cash, so he paid for his transportation in wood cuts and paintings. Neither the redoubtable old sea captain nor the rest of the world realized the value of Gauguin's work in those early years. When Joseph Winchester thought that all these wood cuts and paintings were cluttering up his home he simply burned the lot. He little thought that he was burning up a fortune.

Another South Pacific individualist and one who Nancy Hall Rutgers well remembers, was Robert Dean Frisbee. A man of true genius, Frisbee had something less than the strength and fortitude of a Captain Winchester. James Norman Hall corresponded with Frisbee over the years and helped this struggling writer along on many occasions. A thin, emaciated man, the troubled Frisbee truly loved his native wife and their children. Although Robert Dean Frisbee is now receiving recognition for his excellent writing, he enjoyed little of it during his life time. He thought of Hall as one of his few real friends.

Certainly not to be forgotten was Charles Nordhoff. Nordhoff had served in France during World War I with Hall and the two men were fast friends for more than thirty years. Nancy Rutgers remembers Nordhoff as a man a good deal more temperamental than her father. Nordhoff was a tall, handsome man who would pace up and down rapidly throwing off ideas by the dozen. Some of his suggestions were usable and many were not. It was usually James Norman Hall, the plodding member of the writing team who would insist that a certain idea had merit. Hall would start to develop the idea he thought worth while and soon Nordhoff would join in.

Charles Nordhoff, besides being a writer, was something of a dreamer. He would plan extensive fishing trips, he was a devoted fisherman or he would carefully plot a cruise to some distant island. His plans seldom materialized and those about him soon realized that they were little more than dreams. Often Nordhoff, as an excuse for delaying his plans would say that he could not leave Hall at such a crucial time since they were in the midst of planning an important chapter. A week or a month later he would still have the same excuse.

The literary styles of Hall and Nordhoff were so similar that often they would alternate chapters in writing a book. Nordhoff would write chapters one and three. Hall would write chapters two and four. When the volume at last was published no one could have guessed the particular author of the vise chapters. Often times they would revise

each other's writing and a certain paragraph would be half written by Hall and half by Nordhoff. After years of working together each person knew exactly how the other thought.

To Nancy and Nick Rutgers Lanikai at times seems far away from Tahiti. They have, of course, a whole shelf of books in their living room to remind them constantly that these bygone days were once a reality. To readers of South Seas stories there is little danger that the volumes Hall and Nordhoff wrote will ever be forgotten. Their books will be constant reminders of a picturesque era from the history of one of the world's most romantic spots.

SERVICE RECORD

James Norman Hall, Colfax, Iowa.

Previous Service: August 18, 1914, to December 1, 1915, 9th Battalion, Royal Fusiliers (British Army).

SERVICE IN FRENCH AVIATION

Date of enlistment: October 11, 1916.

Aviation Schools: October 16, 1916, to June 14, 1917, Buc, Avord, G.D.E.

Breveted: April 23, 1917 (Caudron).

At the Front: Escadrille Lafayette, June 16 to June 26, 1917. Escadrille Spad 112, September 22 to October 3, 1917. Escadrille Lafayette, October 3, 1917, to February 18, 1918.

Final Rank: Sergeant.

SERVICE IN U.S. AVIATION:

Commissioned Captain: February 7, 1918.

At the Front: 103d Pursuit Squadron, February 18 to March 29, 1918. 94th Pursuit Squadron, March 29 to May 7, 1918.

Shot down in combat: May 7, 1918, near Pagny sur-Moselle (Meurthe-et-Moselle).

Prisoner in Germany until the Armistice.

Wounded in combat: June 26, 1917, and May 7, 1918.

DECORATIONS

Distinguished Service Cross.

Légion d'Honneur.

Médaille Militaire.

Croix de Guerre, with five Palms.

H.CON. RES. 214

Sponsor: Faleomavaega.

Date Introduced: March 3, 1994.

House Committee: Post Office and Civil Service.

Official Title: A concurrent resolution honoring James Norman Hall and recognizing his outstanding contributions to the United States and the South Pacific.

Co-sponsors: 232 CURRENT COSPONSORS.

Mar 3, 94 Referred to House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Co-Sponsors: 232 CURRENT COSPONSORS

As Introduced: Smith (IA), Leach, Grandy, Nussle, Lightfoot.

May 18, 94 Abercombie, Ackerman, Andrews (NJ), Andrews (ME), Applegage, Baesler, Ballenger, Barca, Barrett (WI), Becera, Beilenson, Bentley, Berman, Bevill, Bilbray, Bishop, Blackwell, Bonior, Brooks, Browder, Brown (FL), Brown (CA), Brown (OH), Bryant, Burton, Byrne, Cantwell, Cardin, Clay, Clement, Clyburn, Coble, Coleman, Collins (MI), Condit, Conyers, Cooper, Coppersmith, Costello, Cox, Coyne, Crane, Darden, DeFazio, de la Garza, DeLauro, Dellums, de Lugo, Deutsch, Diaz-Balart, Dickey, Dicks, Dixon, Dooley, Doolittle, Dornan, Dreier, Durbin, Edwards (TX), Edwards (CA), Emerson, Engel, Evans, Farr, Fazio, Fields (LA), Fingerhut, Flake, Foglietta, Ford (TN), Ford (MI), Frank (MA), Franks (CT), Frost, Furse, Gallegly, Gejdenson, Gephardt, Geren, Gibbons, Gilman, Goodling, Green, Gunderson, Gutierrez, Hall (OH), Hamburg, Hansen, Hastings, Hayes, Hefner, Hochbrueckner, Holden, Horn, Houghton, Hoyer, Hunter, Hutto, Hyde, Inslee, Jacobs, Jefferson, Johnson (SD), Johnston, Kanjorski, Kaptur, Kasich, Kennedy, Kennelly, Kildee, Kim, Klein, Klink, Kopetski, Lafalce, Lancaster, Lantos, LaRocco, Laughlin, Lehman, Levy, Lewis (GA), Lipinski, Livingston, Lloyd, Lowey, McCloskey, McDade, McDermott, McKeon, McKinney, McNulty, Manton, Martinez, Matsui, Mazzoli, Meek, Menendez, Miller (CA), Mineta, Mink, Moakley, Montgomery, Moran, Murphy, Murtha, Myers, Neal (MA), Norton, Oberstar, Ortiz, Orton, Owens, Packard, Pallone, Parker, Pastor, Payne (NJ), Payne (VA), Pelosi, Peterson (MN), Peterson (FL), Pickle, Poshard, Price (NC), Quillen, Rahall, Rangel, Ravenel, Reed, Regula, Reynolds, Richardson, Roemer, Rohrabacher, Romero-Barcelo, Rose, Rowland, Roybal-Allard, Rush, Sabo, Sangmeister, Sarpalius, Schumer, Scott, Shepherd, Smith (OR), Snowe, Solomon, Spence, Spratt, Stark, Stokes, Swett, Swift, Synar, Tanner, Tauzin, Taylor (MS), Tejeda, Torres, Torricelli, Towns, Traficant, Tucker, Underwood, Unsoeld, Valentine, Velázquez, Vento, Volkmer, Vucanovich, Waters, Watt, Waxman, Weldon, Wheat, Whitten Wolf, Woolsey, Wynn, Young (FL), Young (AK).

June 13, 94, Hughes, Wilson, Washington, Skeen.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to commend the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] for his eloquent comments and for focusing our attention on the outstanding achievements and background and courage of James Norman Hall, a true hero.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT].

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, one of the problems when you speak second after the gentleman from American Samoa, he has taken most of my speech. Only the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] can do it in such an eloquent way.

I would also mention that through the vagaries of politics, Mr. Hall's home now is in my congressional district, after the reapportionment, as is Grinnell College. I think it is only fitting today that we honor James Norman Hall, and certainly urge strong support for this resolution.

As our friend from American Samoa has so eloquently outlined, Mr. Hall had a very colorful and exciting background. One of the books that he did not mention, "The Men Against the Sea," along with "Mutiny on the Bounty," are, I think, two of the greatest publications that reflect the South Pacific, American Samoa, and that part of the country, which I fortunately had an opportunity to visit with the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA] a few years ago.

□ 1300

And it was one of those things that one sometimes wonders how someone out of the middle of the continental United States can go to such a beautiful part of the world and then, through words, put it on paper and capture that beautiful part of the world and then, through words, put it on paper and capture that romance and excitement and adventure that goes with that for virtually generations to enjoy thereafter. I think that when we look at 16 major works that James Norman Hall wrote on his own, I do not know of any author that would come close in terms of the type of credibility, the type of intellect that went into those writings. I think that if nothing else Mr. Hall's works have stimulated the imaginations, and they certainly have entertained millions.

We are very proud to claim him as a part of Iowa's heritage.

ENI, we really appreciate your offering this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this very strongly.

I would like to express my support for House Concurrent Resolution 215, honoring James Norma Hall, noted author and Iowa native. He in fact hailed from my congressional district.

Mr. Hall grew up in the small town of Colfax, IA. Shortly after leaving Colfax, Mr. Hall served in the British and French Air Force. He fought in the trenches in World War I, flew numerous combat missions with the Lafayette Flying Corps, and was commissioned as a captain in the U.S. Air Force. Hall was wounded twice during his years in combat and was shot down in May 1918. In addition, he was a prisoner of war until the war ended. For his service during the war he was decorated with the Distinguished Service Cross Award. After World War I he traveled to the South Pacific where he and coauthor Charles A. Nordhoff collaborated on books that will always be constant reminders of a picturesque era or history in one of the world's most romantic spots. These books included "Mutiny on the Bounty," "Men Against the Sea," and "Pitcairn's Island." Hall also wrote 16 major works on his own along with many essays and poems.

James Michener once said of James Norman Hall, "He was the most loved American who ever came to the tropics. When he died, on every island, even where no man could read, there was sorrow."

Mr. Hall's works stimulated the imaginations of and entertained millions. We are proud to claim him as part of Iowa's heritage.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman from Iowa for his eloquent words.

Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I yield to the other gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH].

Mr. LEACH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 215, a resolution honoring James Norman Hall for his outstanding contributions to the United States and the

South Pacific. I would also like to thank our colleague, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for his leadership in bringing this Iowa native son recognition he so richly deserves.

The events of James Norman Hall's life read in many ways like the novels for which he is so justly famous. He was born on a family farm near Colfax, IA, and graduated Phi Beta Kappa from nearby Grinnell College. After joining the British Army and fighting in the trenches of the western front of World War I, Hall flew with the famed Lafayette Escadrille, was wounded twice, and ultimately shot down and imprisoned in Germany until the armistice.

After the war, Hall moved to the South Pacific. There he became an author of world renown, writing some 16 major works, as well as numerous essays and poems, lyrics for a number of songs, and several plays.

Hall is, of course, best known for the trilogy he coauthored with Charles Nordoff: "Mutiny on the Bounty," "Men Against the Sea," and "Pitcairn's Island."

The three books tell the story of the famous mutiny, of Captain Bligh's epic sea voyage in an open boat after being set adrift by the mutineers, and settlement of Fletcher Christian's band on Pitcairn Island. Many who never read the books learned the story of human courage and endurance they chronicled from Clark Gable and Charles Laughton or Marlon Brando and Trevor Howard, in their epic film portrayals.

But James Norman Hall has left us far more than and a rich literary legacy. The senseless slaughter of World War I shattered the optimism that marked the end of the 19th century and for many made the 20th appear a century of dark pessimism and darker history. Hall survived the worst of what was supposed to be "the war to end wars," yet remained throughout his life a man of unflagging optimism and idealism.

The courage and character his books portray, his life exemplified.

Another chronicler of the South Pacific, James Michener, said Hall was "the most loved American who ever came to the tropics. He had a gentle humor, an abiding concern for people and a ready franc for anyone in need * * *. When he died, on every island in the Pacific, even when no man could read, there was sorrow."

Hall's epitaph was taken from a poem he wrote as a youth in Iowa: "Look to the northward stranger. Just over the hillside there. Have you in your travels seen, a land more passing fair." Two disparate lands, Iowa and the islands of the South Pacific, both "passing fair," linked the life and work of an extraordinary man, James Norman Hall.

Mr. Speaker, again I recommend House Concurrent Resolution 215 to my colleagues and express my gratitude to Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA for providing the House this opportunity to acknowledge the achievement of James Norman Hall.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I want to thank the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LEACH] for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN].

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I was honored that ENI asked me to speak because I have traveled through this most beautiful part of the world with our distinguished Representative from American Samoa. It is a pleasure to join this commemorative because Capt. James Norman Hall was one of the heroes of my youth.

I had a friend who had about 20 of his books and, of course, a young person reaches for Mutiny on the Bounty first and then Pitcairn's Island, then Hurricane. But I had known of his exploits with Lafayette Escadrille because I knew a great Hollywood director, William Wellman, Sr., who was one of the youngest members of that squadron who flew with Hall and had a great, long association with him as a young man. I had not known he had guided America's ace of aces, America's leading eagle, Eddie Rickenbacker, automobile racer to his first victory in the skies over the trenches of Europe.

When I found my dad's orders to go to pilot training with the Signal Corps and asked him why he ended up in artillery, he said the Pope was negotiating an end to the war in the Christmas of 1917 so he threw in the towel, but he said we used to shake our fists at the guys from Barley Duke because they would also arrive after the Germans had strafed the trenches.

I said, dad, that is the guy's view from the mud on the ground. Our pilots in that war came in late, had a heroic record. And to know that James Hall was one of their leaders and a hero, that is just things brought out of this commemorative by my colleague from Iowa and by ENI that have resurrected this hero of my youth.

Coming from the middle of America, the heartland of our farmland, Iowa, it is just another of these incredible stories of America's heroes that should be passed on to our youths.

I will take an hour special order tonight to talk about the great navy admiral, 58 years on active duty, Rear Adm. John Duncan Bulkeley who rescued MacArthur from Corregidor and threw the wreath into the English Channel with Clinton D-day morning at dawn.

I just hope that people will read this RECORD and look at these great people like this son of Iowa, James Norman Hall, and understand that our heritage is truly worth teaching to our kids in grade school and in high school and in college, that the United States of America is, as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] calls it, a unique civilization, unknown in all of history, representing all the peoples of this tiny little delicate planet.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] for adding his comments to this tribute.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa [Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA].

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my dear friend from California for his comments. What is most interesting, at least in my observation about this son of Iowa, is where James Norman Hall, growing up in the middle of farm country without a great body of water nearby, could learn to enjoy the island life and island community. The fact that he came from midwest America and spent the rest of his life in the South Pacific, is evidence that he appreciated what island living is like. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, one other observation about land, sea, and air, being born in 1887, he was 16 years of age when the Wright brothers flew and found themselves dueling in deadly combat just a few years after that. It is an amazing life story. I thank everybody for this commemorative.

Mr. GRANDY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to pay tribute to an Iowan who left the State and went on to become a world-renowned writer. James Norman Hall traveled all over the world, fought as an ace fighter pilot during World War I, and to this day continues to expand the mind of readers young and old through his writings.

James Norman Hall was a well-loved Iowan who left the State in 1910 at the age of 23. He was born in the small town of Colfax, just east of Des Moines. He received both his undergraduate and graduate degrees from Grinnell College, just across the county line from his home. After such a wonderful grounding, and like many Iowans since, James Norman Hall left Iowa never to return permanently.

I think it is very important to point out that being a lifelong Iowan and maintaining a permanent and continuous residence in the State are not necessarily the same thing. Hall considered himself an Iowan even though he left the State at a relatively young age. To quote from his biography, "My Island Home," on page 329, "Iowa, for all the years I have been away from it, has always been and still is home to me." That sentiment continues to be shared by Iowans worldwide.

Hall's World War I dramas were at least as exciting as his most famous work, "Mutiny on the Bounty." Hall fought with both British ground forces in Normandy with Lord Kitchener, and with French aviators before joining the American Air Corps.

In the early days of aviation when man and machinery tentatively went aloft, this brave Iowan became an ace pilot. He volunteered for war duty with the French Escadrille Lafayette in 1916, when America had no Air Corps or Air Force. It was in 1918 that he joined the

American Air Corps and flew with fellow "Ace" Eddie Rickenbacher. He was shot down behind enemy lines in 1918 and was imprisoned in Germany until the end of the war. The Germans greatly respected him however because he had spared the life of a German fighter pilot in a Christmas-day dogfight.

After the war he met up with Charles Nordhoff to write the history of the Escadrille titled "The Lafayette Flying Corps." The long and distinguished collaborative writing career of these two gentleman had then commenced. Hall's main literary tie to America was the magazine Atlantic Monthly. I read Hall's "Mutiny on the Bounty," when I was in the ninth grade.

A fitting tribute, the James Norman Hall Museum in Tahiti Nui (French Polynesia), opened this spring and I am glad that House Concurrent Resolution 215 will be displayed in the museum. Iowa has not forgotten this famous son, the archives at Grinnell College have also preserved much of this magnificent writer's papers.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I join with my good friend and colleague, Delegate FALEOMAVAEGA, and the entire Iowa congressional delegation in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 215 honoring James Norman Hall for his outstanding contribution to Iowa, our Nation, and the South Pacific.

James Norman Hall, a native son of the State of Iowa, was born in Colfax in 1887 and was a decorated war hero in World War I. He was an adventurer and the acclaimed author of "Mutiny on the Bounty," "Pitcairn's Island," and "Hurricane."

In 1920, he moved to Tahiti and for over three decades his writing enriched the world's understanding of the South Pacific. The resolution quotes James Michener describing James Norman Hall as "the most loved American who ever came to the tropics and that when he died, on every island in the Pacific were even no man could read, there was sorrow."

I hope you will join us as we honor this great American by passing this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RICHARDSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 215

Whereas James Norman Hall, a native son of the State of Iowa born in Colfax in 1887, and a graduate of Grinnell College, was a decorated war hero, noted adventurer, and acclaimed author, who was revered and loved in France and Tahiti, and throughout the South Pacific;

Whereas James Norman Hall exhibited an unwavering commitment to freedom and democracy by volunteering for military service early in World War I and by fighting alongside British forces in the worst of trench warfare, including the Battle of Loos, where he was one of few survivors;

Whereas James Norman Hall continued his fight for liberty by becoming a pilot in the Lafayette Escadrilles, an American pursuit squadron of the French Air Service, and his courageous and daring feats in air battles earned him France's highest medals, including the Legion d'Honneur, Medaille Militaire, and Croix de Guerre with 5 Palms;

Whereas James Norman Hall was commissioned as a Captain in the United States Army Air Service when the United States entered World War I, continued his legendary exploits as an ace pilot, acted as wing commander and mentor for then-Lieutenant Eddie Rickenbacker, and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross Medal, for gallantry and bravery in battle, by General Pershing;

Whereas James Norman Hall sought serenity after the destructiveness of World War I, moved to the South Pacific in 1920, married a Tahitian woman and lived in Tahiti for over 3 decades, and wrote a prodigious number of articles and books in the library of his home in Arue, Tahiti;

Whereas much of James Norman Hall's writing enriched the world's understanding of Tahiti and the South Pacific;

Whereas James Norman Hall coauthored, with Charles Nordhoff, classic masterpieces that have come to epitomize the tropics, including "Mutiny on the Bounty", "Pitcairn's Island", and "Hurricane";

Whereas, despite James Norman Hall's achievements as a decorated war hero and famed literary figure, he remained to his death a humble, self-effacing man who endeared himself to the people of Tahiti with his keen sense of generosity, kindness, and real concern for others, prompting James Michener to state that James Norman Hall was "the most loved American who ever came to the tropics" and that when "he died, on every island in the Pacific where even no man could read, there was sorrow; and

Whereas the home and library of James Norman Hall, in Arue, Tahiti, are being restored as a museum to honor this son of the State of Iowa and hero of the United States, England, France, and French Polynesia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) honors James Norman Hall and recognizes his outstanding contributions to the United States, France, Tahiti, and the South Pacific, including his extraordinary service rendered in wartime for the defense of freedom, his outstanding achievements in the literary field, and his lifework that has enriched the world's understanding of the people of the South Pacific; and

(2) requests the President of the United States to provide for the presentation of a copy of this concurrent resolution by appropriate officials of the United States Government to the President of Tahiti Nui (French Polynesia), so that it may be publicly displayed at the James Norman Hall Museum in Tahiti, where it will express the appreciation of the people and government of the United States for the contributions of James Norman Hall and will show recognition of the achievements of this great son of the State of Iowa.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BYRNE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each.

HEALTH CARE REFORM VOTES

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

Mr. MICHEL. Madam Speaker, I submit for the RECORD the votes on health care reform which took place in full committee in the Education and Labor Committee on June 16, and in the Ways and Means Committee on June 17, 1994:

HEALTH CARE MARKUP, JUNE 16, 1994

The following recorded votes were taken on June 16, 1994 in the Committee on Education and Labor during full committee consideration of Chairman FORD's mark, H.R. 3600, Health Security Act of 1994:

1. An amendment by Representative Roukema, in the nature of a substitute, to Representative Roemer's amendment requiring the National Health Board to recommend benefit changes and other savings should the Health Security Act increase the Federal deficit. Representative Roukema's amendment included the Roemer language regarding recommended savings and, in addition, would have provided for an early warning to Congress if the Board had reason to believe such savings would be necessary. The substitute amendment was defeated 15–25.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Ford, "nay."
Mr. Clay, "nay."
Mr. Miller (CA), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Murphy, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Kildee, "nay."
Mr. Williams, "nay."
Mr. Martinez, "nay."
Mr. Owens, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Sawyer, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Payne, "nay" by proxy.
Ms. Unsoeld, "nay" by proxy.
Ms. Mink, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Andrews, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Reed, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Roemer, "yea."
Mr. Engel, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Becerra, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Scott, "nay."
Mr. Green, "nay" by proxy.
Ms. Woolsey, "nay."
Mr. Romero-Barcelo, "yea."
Mr. Klink, "yea."
Ms. English, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Strickland, "nay."
Mr. de Lugo, "nay."
Mr. Faleomavaega, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Baesler, "yea."
Mr. Underwood, "nay" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mr. Goodling, "yea."
Mr. Petri, "yea" by proxy.

Ms. Roukema, "yea."
Mr. Gunderson, "yea."
Mr. Armey, Not voting.
Mr. Fawell, "yea."
Mr. Ballenger, "yea."
Ms. Molinari, "yea."
Mr. Barrett, "nay."
Mr. Boehner, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Cunningham, Not voting.
Mr. Hoekstra, "yea."
Mr. McKeon, Not voting.
Mr. Miller (FL), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Castle, "yea."

2. An amendment by Rep. Roemer to require the National Health Board to provide Congress with a fiscal analysis of the Health Security Act's impact on the Federal budget. In the event the Act would significantly increase the deficit, the Board would recommend benefit changes and other appropriate programmatic savings and submit such recommendations for Congressional approval. The amendment was defeated 13–29.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Ford, "nay."
Mr. Clay, "nay."
Mr. Miller (CA), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Murphy, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Kildee, "nay."
Mr. Williams, "nay."
Mr. Martinez, "nay."
Mr. Owens, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Sawyer, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Payne, "nay" by proxy.
Mrs. Unsoeld, "nay" by proxy.
Mrs. Mink, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Andrews, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Reed, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Roemer, "yea."
Mr. Engel, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Becerra, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Scott, "nay."
Mr. Green, "nay" by proxy.
Ms. Woolsey, "nay."
Mr. Romero-Barcelo, "yea."
Mr. Klink, "yea."
Ms. English, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Strickland, "nay."
Mr. De Lugo, "nay."
Mr. Faleomavaega, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Baesler, "yea."
Mr. Underwood, "nay" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mr. Goodling, present.
Mr. Petri, "yea" by proxy.
Mrs. Roukema, "yea."
Mr. Gunderson, "yea."
Mr. Armey, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Fawell, "yea."
Mr. Ballenger, "yea."
Ms. Molinari, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Barrett, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Boehner, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Cunningham, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Hoekstra, "yea."
Mr. McKeon, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Miller (FL), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Castle, "yea."

3. An amendment by Representative Ballenger to require State agencies and health care plans to coordinate their efforts in providing services to individuals with disabilities under several Federal and State programs. The amendment was agreed to 42–0.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Ford, "yea."
Mr. Clay, "yea."
Mr. Miller (CA), "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Murphy, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Kildee, "yea."
Mr. Williams, "yea."
Mr. Martinez, "yea."
Mr. Owens, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Sawyer, "yea."
Mr. Payne, "yea" by proxy.
Mrs. Unsoeld, "yea" by proxy.
Mrs. Mink, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Andrews, not voting.
Mr. Reed, "yea."
Mr. Roemer, "yea."
Mr. Engel, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Becerra, "yea."
Mr. Scott, "yea."
Mr. Green, "yea" by proxy.
Ms. Woolsey, "yea."
Mr. Romero-Barceló, "yea."
Mr. Klink, "yea."
Ms. English, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Strickland, "yea."
Mr. de Lugo, "yea."
Mr. Faleomavaega, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Baesler, "yea."
Mr. Underwood, "yea" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mr. Goodling, "yea."
Mr. Petri, "yea" by proxy.
Mrs. Roukema, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Gunderson, "yea."
Mr. Armey, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Fawell, "yea."
Mr. Ballenger, "yea."
Ms. Molinari, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Barrett, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Boehner, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Cunningham, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Hoekstra, "yea."
Mr. McKeon, "yea."
Mr. Miller (FL), "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Castle, "yea."

4. An amendment by Representative Hoekstra to provide that no State shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Health Security Act unless a majority of voters in the State have chosen, by referendum, to be a participating State under the Act. The amendment was defeated 14–28.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Ford, "nay."
Mr. Clay, "nay."
Mr. Miller (CA), "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Murphy, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Kildee, "nay."
Mr. Williams, "nay."
Mr. Martinez, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Owens, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Sawyer, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Payne, "nay" by proxy.
Mrs. Unsoeld, "nay."
Mrs. Mink, "nay."
Mr. Andrews, not voting.
Mr. Reed, "nay."
Mr. Roemer, "nay."
Mr. Engel, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Becerra, "nay."
Mr. Scott, "nay."
Mr. Green, "nay" by proxy.
Ms. Woolsey, "nay."
Mr. Romero-Barceló, "nay."
Mr. Klink, "nay."
Ms. English, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Strickland, "nay."
Mr. de Lugo, "nay."
Mr. Faleomavaega, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Baesler, "nay."
Mr. Underwood, "nay" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mr. Goodling, "yea."
Mr. Petri, "yea" by proxy.
Mrs. Roukema, "yea."
Mr. Gunderson, "yea."
Mr. Armey, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Fawell, "yea."
Mr. Ballenger, "yea."
Ms. Molinari, "yea."
Mr. Barrett, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Boehner, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Cunningham, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Hoekstra, "yea."
Mr. McKeon, "yea."
Mr. Miller (FL), "yea."
Mr. Castle, "nay."

The following recorded votes were taken on June 17, 1994 in the Committee on Ways and Means during consideration of Acting Chairman Gibbons' substitute proposal for H.R. 3600, The Health Security Act of 1994:

Pending was an amendment by Mr. Houghton to reduce from 250 to 50 the minimum number of employees required for a firm to establish a self-insured health plan for its employees, as a way of fulfilling its requirement under the bill to provide health coverage. Mr. Neal offered a substitute amendment which would reduce the minimum number of employees from 250 to 100. Mr. Archer offered an amendment to the Neal substitute to reduce the minimum number of employees to 1. Mr. Houghton subsequently offered an amendment to the Neal substitute to reduce the minimum number of employees to 50.

On the amendment by Mr. Archer to reduce from 250 to 1 the minimum number of employees required for a firm to establish a self-insured health plan for its employees: Defeated 24–14.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Gibbons, "nay."
Mr. Rostenkowski, "nay."
Mr. Pickle, "nay."
Mr. Rangel, "nay."
Mr. Stark, "nay."
Mr. Jacobs, "nay" by proxy.
Mr. Ford (TN), "nay."
Mr. Matsui, "nay."
Mrs. Kennelly, "nay."
Mr. Coyne, "nay."
Mr. Andrews (TX), "nay."
Mr. Levin, "nay."
Mr. Cardin, "nay."
Mr. McDermott, "nay."
Mr. Kleczka, "nay."
Mr. Lewis (GA), "nay."
Mr. Payne (VA), "nay."
Mr. Neal (MA), "nay."
Mr. Hoagland, "nay."
Mr. McNulty, "nay."
Mr. Kopetski, "nay."
Mr. Jefferson, "nay."
Mr. Brewster, "nay."
Mr. Reynolds, "nay" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mr. Archer, "yea."
Mr. Crane, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Thomas (CA), "yea."
Mr. Shaw, "yea."
Mr. Sundquist, "yea" by proxy.
Mrs. Johnson (CT), "yea."
Mr. Bunning, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Grandy, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Houghton, "yea."
Mr. Herger, "yea."
Mr. McCrery, "yea."
Mr. Hancock, "yea."
Mr. Santorum, "yea."
Mr. Camp, "yea."

On the amendment by Mr. Houghton to reduce from 250 to 50 the minimum number of employees required for a firm to establish a self-insured health plan for its employees: Defeated 22–16.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Gibbons, "nay."
Mr. Rostenkowski, "nay."
Mr. Pickle, "nay."
Mr. Rangel, "nay."
Mr. Stark, "nay."
Mr. Jacobs, "nay" by proxy.

Mr. Ford (TN), "nay."
Mr. Matsui, "nay."
Mrs. Kennelly, "nay."
Mr. Coyne, "nay."
Mr. Andrews (TX), "nay."
Mr. Levin, "nay."
Mr. Cardin, "nay."
Mr. McDermott, "nay."
Mr. Kleczka, "nay."
Mr. Lewis (GA), "nay."
Mr. Payne (VA), "nay."
Mr. Neal (MA), "nay."
Mr. Hoagland, "yea."
Mr. McNulty, "nay."
Mr. Kopetski, "nay."
Mr. Jefferson, "nay."
Mr. Brewster, "yea."
Mr. Reynolds, "nay" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mr. Archer, "yea."
Mr. Crane, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Thomas (CA), "yea."
Mr. Shaw, "yea."
Mr. Sundquist, "yea" by proxy.
Mrs. Johnson (CT), "yea."
Mr. Bunning, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Grandy, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Houghton, "yea."
Mr. Herger, "yea."
Mr. McCrery, "yea."
Mr. Hancock, "yea."
Mr. Santorum, "yea."
Mr. Camp, "yea."

On the amendment by Mr. Neal to reduce from 250 to 100 the minimum number of employees required for a firm to establish a self-insured health plan for its employees: Adopted 36–2.

DEMOCRATS

Mr. Gibbons, "yea."
Mr. Rostenkowski, "yea."
Mr. Pickle, "yea."
Mr. Rangel, "yea."
Mr. Stark, "nay."
Mr. Jacobs, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Ford (TN), "yea."
Mr. Matsui, "yea."
Mrs. Kennelly, "yea."
Mr. Coyne, "yea."
Mr. Andrews (TX), "yea."
Mr. Levin, "yea."
Mr. Cardin, "yea."
Mr. McDermott, "nay."
Mr. Kleczka, "yea."
Mr. Lewis (GA), "yea."
Mr. Payne (VA), "yea."
Mr. Neal (MA), "yea."
Mr. Hoagland, "yea."
Mr. McNulty, "yea."
Mr. Kopetski, "yea."
Mr. Jefferson, "yea."
Mr. Brewster, "yea."
Mr. Reynolds, "yea" by proxy.

REPUBLICANS

Mr. Archer, "yea."
Mr. Crane, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Thomas (CA), "yea."
Mr. Shaw, "yea."
Mr. Sundquist, "yea" by proxy.
Mrs. Johnson (CT), "yea."
Mr. Bunning, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Grandy, "yea" by proxy.
Mr. Houghton, "yea."
Mr. Herger, "yea."
Mr. McCrery, "yea."
Mr. Hancock, "yea."
Mr. Santorum, "yea."
Mr. Camp, "yea."

The underlying Houghton amendment, as modified by the Neal substitute, was then adopted by voice vote.

IN PRAISE OF RENEWED DIPLOMATIC RELATIONS BETWEEN NEW ZEALAND AND THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Madam Speaker, since 1987, the U.S. Government has restricted political, military, and security contacts with the nation of New Zealand in response to that country's adoption of antinuclear legislation that was perceived to impact adversely on United States military practices.

Although I can understand why our defense ties and ANZUS obligations to New Zealand were terminated, I have never approved of the across-the-board snubbing that Washington forced Wellington to endure for years. While we restricted high-level contacts with New Zealand, our Government had no problem in meeting with leaders from totalitarian states and questionable regimes.

□ 1310

New Zealand is a friend and a democracy that shares our values, and has historically been a close ally of the United States for most of this century. Our two nations have fought at each other's side against aggression in virtually every major conflict in recent times.

Moreover, New Zealand has played an active and positive role in supporting U.S. efforts in international economic fora, such as the Uruguay round of GATT and APEC, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation meetings.

With New Zealand acting as President of the U.N. Security Council, their leadership and close cooperation with the United States, on matters such as U.N. peacekeeping, has been invaluable. The North Korean nuclear crisis has increased focus on the U.N. Security Council and, in part, reinforced the importance of our relations with New Zealand.

When the Clinton administration announced earlier this year that senior-level diplomatic contacts would be resumed with New Zealand for discussion of political, strategic, and broad security matters, I strongly applauded the policy change. The removal of New Zealand's diplomatic handcuffs has been long overdue. We are finally starting to treat our longtime ally as a friend. Yes, we obviously have our differences on certain issues, but we should not have treated New Zealand in such a mean-spirited way.

Although several Members in both Houses of Congress lobbied the administration to lift the unfair restrictions, I feel it was due in great part to the fine efforts of the Embassy of New Zealand that relations were normalized.

In particular, much credit must go to the Honorable Denis McLean, Ambassador of New Zealand, on whose watch in Washington this momentous reconciliation occurred. Over the years, I have watched with admiration Ambassador McLean's patient and persuasive diplomacy on behalf of New Zealand's interests. Moreover, he has had the vision to be an aggressive and active advocate for the welfare of the South Pacific region as a whole. Both on Capitol Hill and in the administration, it is clear that Ambassador McLean has commanded respect.

After 37 years in public service to New Zealand—serving first in Embassy posts such as Second Secretary in Washington on up to Cabinet appointment as Secretary of Defence—Ambassador McLean is now to retire after a brilliant and distinguished career. Suffice it to say that his country has been very well served, indeed.

I would also like to recognize that it is due to the hard work of staff that political successes are made possible. Certainly, Ambassador McLean has been very fortunate in that regard, as the entire New Zealand Embassy staff has performed with distinction.

In particular, Mr. David R. Cunliffe, Second Secretary [political], should be recognized for the outstanding and effective job he has done as the Embassy's congressional liaison officer. Mr. Cunliffe's able assistance was instrumental in laying the groundwork for an improved climate for United States-New Zealand political relations and in supporting United States engagement with the South Pacific. Certainly, it is no exaggeration to say that Mr. Cunliffe's efforts have contributed significantly to how Capitol Hill views New Zealand.

In conclusion, I would salute Ambassador McLean and Second Secretary Cunliffe for a job well done and I wish them well in their future endeavors. The fruits of their labor have given rise to a new era of deep and enduring relations between our two great countries, New Zealand and the United States.

A BIPARTISAN HEALTH CARE BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BYRNE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I want to talk today about passing a bipartisan health bill. House Republicans are committed to trying to help pass a bipartisan health bill this year. We believe it is possible to write a bill on a bipartisan basis, possibly starting with the Rowland-Bilirakis bill, which has 35 Republicans and 35 Democrats cosponsoring it, certainly building on that and developing a bill which is market oriented, which has insurance reform, which has group insurance for small business, which has malpractice reform, which has a number of steps that most Americans agree with.

Madam Speaker, we began working on the House Republican side in July 1991, when Congressman MICHEL, our

leader, founded the House Republican Task Force on Health. That was back when President Bush was still President. We have been working now for virtually 3 years on how to write a health reform bill.

Madam Speaker, we have offered to the Democratic leadership to work on a bipartisan health reform bill. I was very disappointed to see the article in the New York Times today, "GOP in the House trying to block health care bill," because I think that article is just plain factually wrong. The article begins, which I might say was the key part of this, that "House Republicans are trying to keep health care legislation from reaching the House floor in a form that could pass." That paragraph is just plain factually wrong.

What we are trying to do, Madam Speaker, is to write on a bipartisan basis a health reform bill that would strengthen the American people's access to health insurance, that would keep their control over their doctor and their hospital and their choice, that would not kill millions of jobs, that would not crush small business, that would not raise taxes, that would not have big bureaucracy and big regulation, and that would not centralize power in Washington.

Madam Speaker, it is true, we are opposed to the Clinton health plan. We believe the Clinton health plan is big Government, big bureaucracy, big taxation. We believe the Clinton health plan takes control over your health care away from you and gives it to the Washington bureaucracy. I want to say up front we are opposed to the Clinton health plan. We believe that the bill currently in the Committee on Ways and Means by the Democratic leadership is essentially a new version of the Clinton health plan.

Now, Madam Speaker, it is a sad time, but the Committee on Ways and Means Democrats have been playing very clever games. There are members of the Ways and Means Democrats who cannot vote for a tobacco tax increase because they are from a State which grows tobacco, such as Virginia. There are members of the Ways and Means Democrats who cannot really vote to kill jobs and small business with mandates because they are from places like Omaha, NE, and Michigan, so what they have done is, they have created a fiction, an excuse. They have said,

> The House Republicans are forcing us to vote for these things. We are really not for them, but the House Republicans are forcing us to do it.

If you are going to be a Clinton clone and you are going to do what Clinton wants, then I think you should stand up and be honest with your district. I am prepared to go to any district in the country and debate the merits of crushing small business and killing jobs. I am prepared to go to any district in the country and debate whether or not you need a tax increase to pay for a health system that is already too expensive and ought to become less expensive.

However, far more important, Madam Speaker, than the debate over specific issues, or the effort by the Clinton clones to avoid being responsible for their votes by blaming House Republicans for scaring them into doing it, far more important is this message to the American people: House Republicans are reaching out to any individual Democrat with the courage to work with us on a bipartisan basis to write a market-oriented group insurance for small business, relieve hospitals from antitrust so they can buy expensive equipment intelligently, have malpractice reform to lower cost, offer tax fairness to individuals self-employed and to the unemployed and to family farms.

We believe that with medical savings accounts and with other good ideas, that we can work with individual Democrats to put together a bipartisan package. We applaud those Democrats who have had the courage, for example, in the Rowland-Bilirakis bill, 35 of them, to cosponsor a bipartisan bill.

We also want to reach out to the Democratic leadership. I have personally on four occasions told the Democratic majority leader that we would like to work with them to write a bipartisan bill. What we cannot do is, we cannot help pass the Clinton big Government, big bureaucracy, big tax increase, anti-jobs, anti-small business, anti-individual control over their own health bill.

Madam Speaker, I think sometimes when the Democratic leadership gets frustrated and when it gets excited and it says "Republicans don't want to pass anything," that is because they define the Clinton plan as the only thing.

The fact is in the most recent Gallup Poll over 50 percent of the American people now reject the Clinton health plan, because over 50 percent of the American people do not want Washington to run their hospital, to control their doctor, to decide on their medicine, to take control away from them over their own life.

Madam Speaker, I just wanted to come to the floor today at the end of the week to say when we come back on Monday I hope there can be some bipartisanship from the Democratic leadership. I hope the President will be willing to engage in bipartisanship and I hope they will quit trying to pass a big Government plan and work with us.

TRUE BIPARTISANSHIP IN HEALTH CARE REFORM

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

Mr. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, the Republican whip, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH], was talking about the need for true bipartisanship in health care reform, and I commend the statement that he made. I think it was a very important statement.

He suggested that a good starting point for bipartisan cooperation in health care reform would be the Rowland-Bilirakis bill, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. ROWLAND] being a Democrat, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] being a Republican. They have joined together with a large number of Republicans and Democrats in focusing on what I think the American people really want to have us focus on, and that is portability, preexisting condition, medical malpractice or tort reform, and access either to insurance or access to the medical system.

As this debate has occurred over the last couple of years, I have heard from many, maybe disparate elements of society, indeed, from many diverse interests in my own district, and the focus always comes down to these issues.

There are just a lot of elements of what is being considered here in Congress being talked about that is not within the focus of the American public. They do want us to address those things that are broken in our health care system, but I think they want to preserve that which works and works well, and I believe that most people will agree that we do have the finest health care system in the world. It has some deficiencies which should be attended to, but we should not, as the old saying goes, throw the baby out with the bath water.

We need to keep that which is right and fix that which is, in fact, broken. There is an awful lot that is more right about our system than there is that is wrong.

I also think that it is very important that we take the time to do well whatever we do rather than that we do it quickly.

I was somewhat amused to see, amused, concerned to see the Memorial Day break period a lot of editorial commentary to the fact that Congress had missed the boat, missed the deadline; we had not acted by Memorial Day, and that surely we must act by July 4, and if we do not by July 4, why certainly by the August break.

I do think it is important to have a timetable and to try to meet that timetable. I do not think we should dally or dawdle, but this is, after all, an issue. We are talking about tampering with affecting somewhere in the neighborhood of one-sixth to one-seventh of the Nation's economy, and I do not think that it is something we should hasten to fiddle with.

I think we should carefully deal with the situation, and I think ultimately the American people would thank us for having done well rather than having done quickly whatever we do.

Madam Speaker, finally, I want to say that the rhetoric surrounding the subject of health care has been very, very substantial. I have noted and been concerned over the course of the past many months that when the administration calls for bipartisanship, I sense that what they are really talking about is it would be considered bipartisan if the Republicans said they were for the President's proposal.

□ 1340

That to me is not bipartisanship. Bipartisanship is where you lay all of the differing ideas out on the table and come to some compromise, some resolution of the differing ideas, rather than just having one party climb on board totally in support of the other party.

I think that definition of bipartisanship is far too narrow and does not lend itself to bringing about a spirit of comity in which true bipartisanship can be achieved.

So I think the remarks of the Republican whip were very appropriate in his call for true bipartisanship. Once again I think the Rowland-Bilirakis bill, as he suggested, would be a fine place to start.

NAFTA'S SUCCESS

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Madam Speaker, 6 months ago, this body had some of the most acrimonious debate on an issue, the North American Free-Trade Agreement. Is it good for the United States, or is it bad policy for the American worker and our country?

□ 1320

Six months after the implementation began, the jury is in on NAFTA, and the verdict is that it has been a resounding success for American jobs, for American exports, and for the American economy. That verdict bodes well for all Americans. So that giant sucking sound that Ross Perot talked about is the sound of jobs and U.S. exports creating jobs in the United States. It is a reinvigorated U.S. economy.

This month we will celebrate the half-year mark of the historic agreement, and even at this early date the results, the statistics are most impressive.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues some articles that document these impressive statistics which I will include at the end of my remarks.

In the first 3 months of 1994, United States exports to Mexico rose by $1.6 billion over the same period in 1993 and Mexico and Canada account for 88 percent of all United States export growth. This is significant for two important reasons. First, because 700,000 Americans already owe their jobs to the fact that United States goods and services are exported to Canada and Mexico. Second, because a fast-growing export rate is in line with Clinton administration projections that NAFTA will create another 200,000 U.S. jobs by 1995. From January 1993 to April 1994, 3.1 million new private sector jobs have been created. NAFTA's success thus far signals that more jobs, many more are to come.

Here are some statistics on specific industries in this first quarter of the year since NAFTA was implemented: Electronics up 50 percent, chemicals up 104 percent, aircraft sales up 241 percent, and most importantly, cars and trucks up 411 percent.

Mr. Speaker, this means 32,000 more American jobs. This means 10 percent totality of more goods in this last quarter, and this means that the export economy to Mexico grew 30 percent during this period.

Mr. Speaker, under NAFTA, United States goods and services are going to continue to flow to Canada and Mexico. U.S. products such as environmental technology, cars, home furnishings and appliances, computer software and farm goods are rolling southward on a massive basis, creating jobs in the United States, export jobs. Before NAFTA, exporting many of these products would have been difficult, if not impossible because of the higher Mexican tariffs.

In my own State of New Mexico, the first 6 months of NAFTA have brought new opportunities and energy for the business community. Intel Corp. and its Rio Rancho operation is preparing to export 400,000 United States made personal computers to Mexico in 1994 alone. Albuquerque's Honeywell Business Management Systems and Controls is getting more business as Mexico builds new hotels and upgrades existing office space. New Mexico's agricultural products are gearing up to take advantage of new markets to the south. New Mexico dairy, cotton, wheat, and other agricultural products are poised for increased exports to that country. All of this translates to more jobs for Americans, and especially in my State of New Mexico.

It is important to remember that the positive effects that the U.S. economy is experiencing is only the beginning. And tariffs on United States exports to Mexico are eliminated over the next 15 years, as the United States transportation sector increases its access to the Mexican market over the next 6 years, and as the United States financial services industry increases its access to Mexican markets over the next 10 years, both Americans and Mexicans will reap the benefits of this important treaty. As NAFTA spurs the growth of the Mexican economy, United States producers can count on greater exports as consumer earnings rise.

NAFTA also provides a gateway to Latin America, a fast growing market of over 811 million people eager to strengthen ties with the United States. It opens up opportunities for the Caribbean, Trinidad and Tobago.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding. I would just like to briefly say one argument that has been used by opponents to the NAFTA is that there has been a narrowing of the trade gap. We have got to realize with free trade with Mexico many of these things that we might have bought from other parts of the world are today being purchased by Americans from Mexico, and that is what has created that narrowing. And I thank the gentleman for his statement and for his support for NAFTA.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I thank the gentleman for his great contributions to NAFTA.

Madam Speaker, I include the articles referred to earlier as follows:

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1994]

U.S.-MEXICO TRADE ADVANCES SHARPLY UNDER NEW ACCORD—BUT AMERICA'S SURPLUS IS CUT AS EXPORTS TRAIL IMPORTS, FUELING DEBATE ON JOBS

(By Allen R. Myerson)

DALLAS, June 5.—In the first three months after a new trade agreement took effect, trade between Mexico and the United States rose sharply to record levels.

Imports from Mexico grew much more rapidly than United States exports, cutting the American trade surplus with Mexico for the first quarter nearly in half. The numbers are the first to measure the impact of the North American Free Trade Agreement since it took affect Jan. 1.

The trade imbalance between the two countries has sharpened antagonism between organized labor, which opposed the trade agreement because it feared the loss of American jobs, and leaders in business and Government, who said the pact would create jobs by making Mexico a huge market for American goods.

United States exports to Mexico rose 15.7 percent, to a record $11.85 billion, seasonally adjusted, in the first quarter compared with the comparable quarter a year earlier, according to the Commerce Department. Imports from Mexico rose 22.5 percent, to a record $11.29 billion. That narrowed the nation's quarterly trade surplus with Mexico by 45.1 percent, to $560 million.

Both sides agree that a single quarter is not enough time to determine a long-term trend and that it is difficult to distinguish the effects of the trade pact from other causes of steadily increasing commerce between the two nations. Indeed, many shipments in the first quarter reflected plans made before the trade agreement was approved in November.

Nevertheless, Mickey Kantor, the United States trade representative, said in an interview on Friday that the agreement was already fulfilling the Administration's promises to create jobs. "Nafta has increased trade substantially," he said. "The balance of trade is not as important as the content of trade and the increase in exports. That's what raises our standard of living."

Some economists and trade experts had expected goods to flow more strongly toward Mexico than toward the United States, because trade barriers, which have been much higher in Mexico, were falling rapidly. A strong peso also favored Mexican purchasers because it made goods imported from the United States more affordable.

But United States exports have been hurt by the persistent recession in Mexico even as the United States economy has grown strongly. Another drag on trade, according to economists, is the complexity of the new pact. Some manufacturers are still figuring out how it applies to their products.

Labor leaders, although cautious about reaching conclusions so soon, saw evidence that the trade pact was increasing Mexican exports more than imports, at the potential cost of jobs in the United States.

"Mickey Kantor always used to say that Nafta will create 200,000 new jobs by 1995," said Mark A. Anderson, director of the A.F.L.-C.I.O.'s task force on trade, "But that was based on an increasing U.S. trade surplus, and our surplus has declined." Mexico, he said, remained a minor market for United States goods but a major source of cheap labor for United States companies.

Mr. Kantor said he saw no relation between the trade balance and jobs, adding that an improving Mexican economy and growing middle class would increase demand for United States products.

In the first quarter, the largest increase in imports came in motor vehicles, up 48.3 percent, to $728 million, from the first quarter of 1993. Among the largest increases in United States exports were electrical and mechanical equipment for industry, raw materials and motor vehicle parts.

Much of the increased trade appeared to reflect closer teamwork between factories across a fading border, with the United States often sending parts and materials to Mexico for final assembly.

IMPORTS FROM MEXICO SURGE

United States trade officials say that imports from Mexico are growing twice as fast as imports from the rest of the world, and American exports to Mexico three times as fast.

"We've really seen the difference with Nafta," said Regina K. Vargo, director of the Commerce Department's Mexico office. "Especially given the relatively flat economy in Mexico."

Quick judgments about the flow of jobs, however, are difficult. Many economists say both nations are likely to gain jobs from increased trade, which would benefit consumers as well.

"The jobs hurt by trade are found in other industries that are expanded through trade," said David M. Gould, a senior economist at the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.

Checks with several corporations that campaigned for the passage of the trade agreement in November brought some reports of increased exports and added jobs. Allied Signal Inc., whose chief executive, Lawrence A. Bossidy, led USA Nafta, a business lobbying group, said shipments of Autolite spark plugs to Mexico would reach 20 million this year, up from 12 million last year.

For the company's plant in Fostoria, Ohio, "that's a whole month's production," helping to make the 1,000 jobs there more stable, if not adding to them, said Paul A. Boudreau, Allied Signal's director of government relations.

LOWER TARIFFS

Under the trade pact, Mexico reduced its tariff on spark plugs to 12 percent this year from 15 percent as the first step toward elimination of the tariff by 1998. The company, however, said stronger marketing and a contract to supply the Mexican operations of the Ford Motor Company had also contributed to its substantial gains.

Texas Instruments Inc. said it was selling three times as many computer printers in Mexico after the removal of a 20 percent tariff, and 10 times as many laptop computers, after a tariff was reduced to 16 percent from 20 percent. But Robert L. Price, a company spokesman, said a stronger sales effort in Mexico had likewise contributed to these advances.

USA Nafta recently published a 15-page list of current and potential export gains, including examples from all three auto makers. General Motors, the report said, had moved enough Chevrolet Cavalier production to Lansing, Mich., from Mexico to create 800 to 1,000 jobs.

G.M. and industry analysts said that the company's quarterly exports to Mexico had risen to more than 11,000 cars and trucks in just the first quarter of 1994 from 1,700 last year. About 8,500 of the cars sent to Mexico, however, were made in Spain, with 1,906 cars and 605 trucks from Canada and the United States.

John F. Smith, Jr., the chief executive of G.M., said earlier this year that he expected exports from the United States and Canada to Mexico to reach 15,000 cars and trucks this year.

CENTER OF DEBATE

The auto industry's sharp cutbacks in the United States and heavy imports from Mexico placed it at the center of last year's trade debate. Last year, G.M. sent 89,000 vehicles from Mexico to the United States.

But Mr. Smith noted that most of the G.M. cars built in Mexico, including those for the domestic market, consist largely of parts from the United States. "As sales increase in Mexico, production in Mexico will support more jobs in the U.S.," he said.

Some labor leaders, however, say the failure of exports to rise as rapidly as imports is all the more striking because Mexico has been much more protective. "The reduction of barriers all of a sudden produced a market there," said Arthur Gundersheim, director of the international affairs at the Amalgamated Clothing and Textile Workers Union. "Our markets were already open." As far as the trade agreement's effect on United States exports is concerned, he said, "The story is that it hasn't done more."

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 13, 1994]

NAFTA SUCCESS MAY AID NEW TRADE ACCORDS

(By Bob Davis)

WASHINGTON.—Already, the North American Free Trade Agreement appears to be a big hit. Exports and imports are surging and U.S. job loss is minimal.

The good news should go a long way to change the politics of trade, easing fears that the U.S. can't compete with low-wage countries. And that should make it easier politically to extend Nafta throughout the hemisphere and negotiate new trade deals elsewhere. Nafta has stiffened the administration's spine concerning trade: Clintonites promise to launch free-trade negotiations with Chile soon and they plan a summit on the Americas in December where trade expansion will be a major theme.

The Nafta boom also should ease passage of the world-trade pact reached under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, once Congress cuts a deal on how to replace lost tariff revenue. Labor unions and Ross Perot, the twin pillars of the anti-Nafta coalition, haven't made much effort to kill the agreement. Indeed a number of unions are now exploring how they can use Nafta. The AFL-CIO is playing a lead role in a U.S.-Mexico symposium, which starts today in Albuquerque, N.M., on health and safety problems in the electronic industry.

Mark Anderson, an AFL-CIO trade economist who opposed Nafta, says he wants to see whether "sunshine and cooperative efforts" can help change labor conditions south of the border.

Making much of this possible is Nafta's early success. The first round of tariff cuts took effect Jan. 1, making U.S. goods more attractive. As Mexican businesses continued their modernization drive, the U.S. exported 9.4% more goods to Mexico in the first quarter than in the previous quarter, after removing usual seasonal fluctuations. At the same time, investment keeps pouring into Mexico. And the Labor Department says only 4,212 workers were certified for extra unemployment benefits due to plants moving production to Mexico or Canada.

Bennett X-Ray Technologies says its has sold $2 million of its advanced mammography systems so far this year to Mexico. Before the 12% tariff on the machine was eliminated, Bennett hadn't managed to sell even one. As Mexico dismantles a labyrinth of rules that blocked auto imports, imports of U.S and Canadian-made cars and trucks in the first five months of the year rose to 19,910, twice as many as in all 1993.

But tariff reductions cut two ways. Imports from Mexico grew 4.6% in the first quarter from the fourth as the U.S. economy hummed along. To feed the sizzling U.S. auto market, auto imports were especially strong, up 48% in the first quarter from the year-earlier quarter.

Overall, though, exports grew more than imports, partly because Mexican tariffs were higher and fell more than those in the U.S. The U.S. ran a $560 million trade surplus with Mexico in the first quarter, compared with $40 million in the fourth, the first increase in the quarterly U.S.-Mexico surplus in two years.

Even optimists couldn't be confident of this outcome, given the misfortunes that have swamped Mexico this year; an armed rebellion in the south; a murdered presidential candidate; anemic growth. Under such circumstances, says Brian Horrigan, a Loomis Sayles economist, Mexican companies and consumers might have hunkered down and bought fewer imported goods.

Economists on all sides warn against reading too much into a single quarter's numbers. Should Mexico devalue its peso, or should its economy sink again into recession, for instance, U.S. export growth could disappear, and with it the trade surplus.

Nafta, though, was always far more than a trade deal. It became a potent symbol of a new age in which global economics vastly influences domestic jobs and politics—and in which the U.S. no longer seems able to control its destiny. Now, though, those fears have dissipated. For all their hugging, Nafta opponents managed to run serious challenges against only two pro-Nafta House members—and lost them both. Meanwhile, at least five anti-Nafta lawmakers face challenges from trade-pact supporters.

In Mexico, the pact helped moderate the government's response to the Chiapas uprising and increase pressure that it run an honest presidential election in August. Nora

Lustig, a Brookings Institution expert, talks of Nafta's "spotlight effect" on the Mexican government to do the right things.

But will Nafta's effects be long-lasting? Forecasters at Clemex-Wefa predict Mexico's sputtering economy will grow 3.5% next year, and more than 5% annually for the rest of the decade. That's more than enough to support a continued U.S. export boom. Both sides, however, have to guard against new forms of protection arising as tariffs continue to drop over the next 15 years. Already, Florida tomato growers and Mexican beef producers are complaining of "dumping."

The real gauge of Nafta's success is whether it disappears as a political issue. That would mean that Americans will have accepted the idea that their future is tied to open trade, which can help rich and poor nations alike.

ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNTABILITY TO THE TAXPAYERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BYRNE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Madam Speaker, yesterday my office reported to the media and to the country that the White House staff during their trip to Normandy on 30 U.S. aircraft, which is five times as many aircraft as were used 10 years ago by Ronald Reagan and George Bush on this trip, at a cost we estimate at $10 to $15 million to the taxpayers, during that trip the President and many of his staff stayed aboard the U.S.S. *George Washington*, and they stayed in staterooms. We reported yesterday that the White House staff stole several hundred dollars' worth of the bathrobes with the insignia on them, and several hundred dollars' worth of the towels and so forth. And then it was reported on television last night and in the media that maybe there was some confusion, that maybe they thought these robes that were very beautiful and monogrammed, that you and I would probably pay $175 or $200 apiece for, they were only $35 according to the Navy because they bought them in bulk, but they said that maybe this was just a mistake. They thought it was part of a gift package.

In fact, in the Washington Post it said the White House staff said if robes and towels were missing they were sure it was part of a mixup. It seems the staff had forked over $11 for a bath kit to use in the shower and some toiletries, and they found the towels and the robes alongside in their staterooms.

Well, today I received a copy of the memo that was put on every single bed in every single stateroom during the President's visit on the U.S.S. *George Washington*. Here is what it says:

Welcome aboard George Washington. Please accept this bath kit as a gift, compliments of the captain and crew. Blue, monogrammed towels may be purchased in the ship's store.

Now, if you see that the blue monogrammed towels can be purchased at the ship's store for $5 or $10, you have got to assume that the robes, which are much more costly and more beautiful, would also be purchased at the ship's store.

The fact of the matter is these items were taken by the White House staff. A lot of people say this is a tempest in a teapot, we are only talking about a few hundred dollars. That is not the issue. There is an arrogance at the White House that you cannot believe. You cannot get them to report to Congress. They feel like they have won this place and everything in the country belongs to them, regardless of whether or not it is paid for by the taxpayer. And we are trying to get them to realize that they have to be responsible to the Congress and the people of this country, and they have to explain when they are spending taxpayer dollars, whether it is 30 U.S. aircraft going over to Normandy instead of 5 or 6 at a cost of $30 million, or whether they are taking bathrobes that do not belong to them off the U.S.S. *George Washington*.

And then they lie about it, they lie about it, because they knew that they were not supposed to take those things, because this document was placed on every one of their beds.

We contacted the Navy and asked them what would happen if an enlisted man or an officer stole a robe or stole property from the Navy or the U.S.S. *George Washington*. I believe the answer will be coming back today or tomorrow saying they would either be severely disciplined or they would be court martialed for stealing U.S. Government property, taxpayers' property. Yet nothing is coming out of the White House except well, they made a mistake.

Two weeks ago they took a U.S. Helicopter, presidential helicopter down to a golf course and played golf at a cost of $14,000 or $15,000 a day for it, and the President was not even on that trip. They later fired the guy that did that.

I am telling you, there is an arrogance down there that must be changed. People who are doing this must be taken to task, either severely disciplined or removed.

We have asked the White House, under the Freedom of Information Act, who went on that trip to Normandy.

There were about 1,000 people who went. Did the taxpayers foot the whole bill, or did many of those people reimburse the taxpayers for the aircraft, or for their hotel or their meals, which incidentally were catered not by the U.S. Air Force, as is normally the case, but they were by a private caterer at three or four times the cost to the taxpayers. So we want the White House to respond and be accountable to the people of the United States.

I serve on the committee of jurisdiction. During the Reagan and Bush administrations, we got cooperation and got the information we requested.

□ 1330

Sometimes it took a couple of weeks, but we did get it. From this administration, it has stonewalled, excuses and lies, and we believe that the people who did this should be taken to task just like the gentleman who used the U.S. helicopter for his golf trip should be taken to task, just like John Sununu was taken to task under the Reagan administration.

We have written to the White House under the Freedom of Information Act asking for a list of those who took these items. They say they do not know who took them. Those staterooms were assigned. Everybody knew who was in which stateroom. They know where those items were taken from. So it is pretty easy to figure out who took them. They should be disciplined.

We want a list of them so we can raise an issue here in the Congress and have an investigation. We want to change the attitude of the White House. We hope the President will take the lead on this. He was on the ship. He is the Commander in Chief, and he should deal with it in a very timely fashion.

REGULATING US OUT OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, few Members of the Congress have escaped the almost daily complaints of the business community over the growing number of regulations coming at them from every government agency at Federal, State and local levels. Besides the anger arising from the frustrations of trying to comply with endless demands to file piles of paper filled with more information about the business than the IRS ever demanded, there is another common denominator among these complaints—fear. Fear of how much farther the government(s) will go—how many more regulations the businesses can tolerate.

Over time we have seen businesses go under. Not because they were poorly managed, not because they had lost a market, but because they were operating in a location which over years of usage had soaked up industrial pollution and they could not raise the money to clean it up. Since at the time most of this pollution occurred, normal industrial waste was not considered either a pollutant or illegal, the responsibility is happening ex post facto—the owner is guilty of breaking a law before it became a law.

We have seen the value of great lots of commercial real estate plummet because of these laws—properties become

unsalable because no bank wants the liability of being caught with polluted property. How extreme these demands have become is indicated by what happened to the city of Columbus, OH.

Three years ago, according to Tony Snow writing in the Washington Times, Columbus decided to pave over some land behind the city's municipal garage. In order to comply with Federal regulations, they had to excavate 2.4 million pounds of dirt, ship the soil to Texas for burning in an incinerator and install devices to measure air quality outside the garage as the work progressed to ensure that the digging would not send toxins into the air affecting bystanders.

When Columbus added the cost of this project to other federally mandated requirements, it estimated the cost of such mandates to the city in the 1990's would be $1.6 billion. A study commissioned by the U.S. Conference of Mayors estimated that environmental mandates alone in 1993 forced the country's largest cities to expend 87.2 million hours in staff time, $1.73 billion in salaries and $4.39 billion in indirect costs. The 5-year costs to the cities of such orders will be $51.8 billion if no extra environmental mandates are added and inflation doesn't exceed 2.7 percent.

If the Congress has been loath to interfere with draconian regulations strangling businesses, maybe when the taxpayers are faced with the bills being run up by the cities and States, the Congress will decide that the requirement to test public drinking water for a pesticide banned 15 years ago and last used by pineapple farmers in 1985 can be dropped.

There may be a change in attitude, also, when some of these cities begin to lose parts of the tax base, and good jobs, because manufacturing companies are forced to move away from the harsh restrictions being laid upon 10 States—among them Maryland—to clean up the air by restricting commuting to work by car.

The program, Employee Trip Reduction, aims to have workers car pool or use public transportation and the companies will be responsible for seeing this gets done or face heavy fines. The restrictions are placed on companies with over 100 employees.

One of our larger employers, after making a survey of his worker's driving patterns and home locations, stated if this regulation is enforced that he will be forced to relocate his plant to another State, because the work force he now has cannot comply with the law. Maryland will lose 350 jobs if the company leaves.

Other employers, with work forces barely over 100, says that they will be forced to cut back on jobs, adding more overtime for the remaining employees.

An analysis of the effect of all of this economic and personal hardship on our companies and our workers in order to clean-up the air is startling. The most hopeful report is that 2 to 3 percent of all commuter traffic will be affected.

At this point, I would like to say that I just don't believe that this great body of which I have been apart for almost 10 years could promulgate such a mischievous, destructive act on our people. Before we start losing our plants and jobs in critical urban areas, we had better have some oversight hearings as to the effects of these regulations.

It seems to me that somewhere, someone has run away with an idea and hang the consequences.

A MATTER OF MORALS, WHAT IS RIGHT AND WHAT IS WRONG

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, earlier today my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] expressed legitimate concern about a situation that has been reported out of the White House where evidently members of the White House staff and/or persons from the media left the *U.S.S. George Washington* during D-day activities with a number of items of linen from the ship, amounting in total to over $560 worth of materials.

This is a matter of some concern, I think, because it goes to the question of what is right and what is wrong. Remembering that this incident took place only a couple of days after the major reports about the helicopter incident where a Marine helicopter was used to take White House staffers on a golf outing, one would have thought that White House staff would be particularly sensitive to the need to maintain any semblance of propriety in what they did. And yet it sounds as though the staff and/or the media involved left the ship with bathrobes, with towels, and with all sorts of other things that at least someone has reported they took as memorabilia. I think that that is a matter of real concern.

I have been on Navy ships where we have had an opportunity to be there, and when you spend some time with the crew, you do like to go away with a little remembrance of the occasion. In most instances, you are given the opportunity to purchase those kinds of things in the ship's store. That could have certainly been done here. Evidently it was not.

If you go to a hotel room and there is a bathrobe hanging in the closet, I do not assume and I do not believe most middle-class Americans assume that that is there to take out of the room and keep. Nor do most middle-class Americans assume when they find towels with monograms in the room that those are theirs to keep.

There is a sense of common decency, a sense of right and wrong that has to govern the affairs of people. It appears as though for some people who are part of the White House contingent that was aboard the U.S.S. *George Washington*, that that was not the case and that they did leave with some of this linen.

I guess what finally concerns me in all of this is the kind of standard that this sets for men and women who serve in the military. Men and women who serve in the military, if caught with that kind of act, which is stealing, it is pilfering, would be at least brought up on charges before their commanding officers and in some cases if it was serious enough they would be court-martialed. It seems to me that that is the standard that ought to be kept in the White House. If the staff was responsible for any of this, they need to be disciplined. And in the case of people who were engaged in serious violations here, they should do what would be done in the military, they should have the equivalent of a court martial, and that is they should be fired.

THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE REORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I have taken out this special order this afternoon as Members prepare to return to their districts, to ask a few of my colleagues who served through calendar year 1993 on the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress to join me in and continue a special order that we had the night before last which was led by the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], who unfortunately cannot be here this afternoon but who wanted us to continue talking about the very important work of the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress and the need to proceed as expeditiously as we possibly can to get to this House floor a package which will bring about meaningful reform of this institution.

A few minutes ago, when we were discussing the program for next week, I chose to again today, as I did last week, ask the representative of the majority when we can anticipate the reform package here on the House floor. When the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress was established in August 1992, it was put into place as a committee to last for 1 year and 1 year only, and it was very unique in that it was the first time in nearly 50 years, since 1947, when the work of the Monroney/LaFollette committee was completed, that a bipartisan, bicameral, equal number of Republicans,

equal number of Democrats, equal number of House Members, equal number of Senators, a committee to put into place to deal with overall reform of this institution.

The thing that appealed to me about the work was that it was to be a committee that was actually going to go out of existence. And that was very unique because, as we found in our work on the committee, there are not too many committees around this place that do their work and then go out of existence.

But the Joint Committee on the Reorganization of Congress did in fact go out of business on December 31 in 1993, and we did complete our work in committee. But unfortunately we have not seen here on the House floor an opportunity to look at, to ruminate over, to discuss, debate, and vote on the provisions that were considered in this package.

I think if one looks at all of the items that were addressed in that work of the joint committee, there were many things that need to be changed. Some things in the package are good, but on an overall basis this is an extraordinarily weak package, and my counterpart on the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] indicated to me that he would report out a measure that would call for a very generous rule allowing virtually all of the 25 amendments that we considered in the joint committee, at least the 8 subject areas that we debated there, and defeated amendments on, to be voted here on the House floor.

Unfortunately, while we were told that we would see it in the fall of 1993, before the committee went out of existence, they said it would be in the early spring of 1994, late spring, and now we are here in the summer.

Last week I was told by the whip that we would have the package considered following the 4th of July district work period. Today we were told by my friend, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], that we will have it considered at some time because discussions are taking place among some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

So it is our hope that we will be able to actually get something to the House floor so that the demand the American people made for the meaningful reform of this Congress can actually take place.

There were more than a few very hardworking members of that joint committee and many of our Members testified before the joint committee—a total of 243 witnesses, 37 hearings—one of the hardest-working Members who focused a great deal on the issue of congressional compliance is my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD], and I am happy to yield to him at this point.

□ 1350

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but be taken by the gentleman's emphasis on the fact that we were a committee that got in and did our work, and we got out, as we were originally set up to do, and we had a year of really focused hard work, and I recall, when we reached towards the end of our deliberations, there were actually some Members in the Congress that thought we ought to go and continue to remain as a committee, and I think the gentleman, and myself and some others said, "You know, that's not why we were set up."

Now we have done our work, and we have dissolved ourselves as a committee, and now the burden is on the House, and the committees that are reference committees here in the House, and the leadership, to get this to move forward so that the time we spent as a committee was well spent, and I would be very disappointed, as one member of that committee, if we did not get something up on the floor here where we can talk about some of the very meaningful reform.

I really appreciate the fact that the gentleman brought up that we were a committee that got our work done and then quit existing as a committee, and one of the criticisms that I ran across, even in my own district, as my colleagues know, is: "There in Congress you set up another committee to address your problems, and nothing ever gets done."

Well, Mr. Speaker, this committee did its work, and now it is up to the leadership of the House to bring this forward.

Mr. DREIER. I yield to the gentleman from Cape Girardeau, MO.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD] has just said something that has sparked my interest here.

As my colleagues know, as we began our deliberations on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, one of the first witnesses to appear; indeed I believe he was the first witness, was the Speaker, who, in a very fine rhetorical statement, admonished the committee. He said, in order for us to proceed, the majority should think, put itself into the position of the minority, and the minority should put itself in the position of the majority in order to understand the problems that the majority faces in moving legislation. I found myself in the course of the deliberations of the committee thinking very often as though I were a member of the majority, and I rather liked the feeling, and I think it may be that we are going to have to become the majority before we are going to be able to move meaningful reform in this House.

Mr. Speaker, both gentlemen are correct. We reported our measure last November. It still has not received any real attention in the House. It has been languishing, and I have begun to question, as one who dealt in good faith throughout this whole process I have begun to question, whether or not there really was a good faith intent to effect reform or if we just had this committee for the purpose of talking about it but doing nothing about it.

Now let me just repeat for emphasis. I think it was a very wise statement, very wise admonishment, that the Speaker gave us, that the minority should think like the majority in order to appreciate their problems and the majority should think like the minority. I think that reality is probably going to have to occur before we are really going to get this job done. We are going to have to become the majority in order to accomplish real reform.

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON], my friend, for his very helpful contributions there, and I will say that I, like my friend from Cape Girardeau, look forward to becoming part of a majority, but we would like to be able to reform this place in a bipartisan manner before that happens, if we possibly can.

At this point I yield to my very good friend from Long Beach who, while not a member of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, was, in fact, one who provided me with a great deal of input because of the tremendous historical perspective that he has had on this institution, having worked here for years, my very good friend, the former president of Long Beach State University, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. DREIER], my colleague, and I congratulate my colleagues who have worked so hard this last year on the effort to try and reform the institution, and I say to the gentleman. "I particularly praise you, DAVID, as chairman of the effort on behalf of the House Republicans, as cochairman of the committee. You have done a terrific job."

I am reminded of the La Follette-Monroney committee and the differences between this committee and that. In 1946, when Mike Monroney, Democratic Congressman from Oklahoma, Phil La Follette, Republican Senator from Wisconsin, were head of that joint committee, it was a true bipartisan effort just as my colleague's has been structurally and just as Democrats and Republicans on that committee want real change. The difference, however, is very simple. That was also a Democratic Congress, I might add, the 79th Congress. The difference is very simple:

The leadership support was given to the work of that committee. Everett Dirksen was then a Member of the House of Representatives. He was a key Republican in making sure those recommendations in a bipartisan way

passed a Democratic controlled House, and the Democratic leadership at the time did not fight every reform.

And the problem here is my colleagues have all done wonderful work, but we really have not had the help and the push of the central leadership of this Chamber. They might well have met with the committee, and they might all have advised my colleagues to think like the other side, and that is wonderful, but now the exercise is over, and there has been no reform in this century the equal of the La Follette-Monroney reform which was then implemented because the next Congress turned out to be the Republican 80th Congress.

Mr. DREIER. If I can reclaim my time, I just want to reconfirm the statement that my colleague makes, and that is, when we went into our markup just before the adjournment at Thanksgiving 1993, we had roughly 25 amendments that were offered by our side in the hopes that we would gain bipartisan support that we sought, and on six, six tie votes, six Republicans voting against six Democrats, 25 of our amendments were defeated, demonstrating that what began as a bipartisan effort ended up being extraordinarily partisan.

My friend is absolutely right; I would be happy to further yield.

Mr. HORN. I just think, if we are going to get something done, I agree with my friend, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. EMERSON] and say, "You're going to need basic change in the House where the majority is committed to reform. Right now you have got the majority in a holding pattern because they have dominated the Chamber for 40 years, and the attitude is: Who needs reform? We're happy. We don't know why you people aren't happy."

I can speak for my freshman colleagues, many of whom are reform minded, and all of whom are at least somewhat reform minded. Many of them have been in key roles of leadership in their own legislature: President pro tem, majority leaders, so forth. They cannot believe the Chamber they have come to. This is the citadel of freedom.

This is the large Chamber, granted. But, my heavens, committees with overlapping jurisdictions that are laughable compared to what they ought to be. It is something that La Follette-Monroney consolidated at one time, has become unconsolidated in the 1970's with the proliferation of subcommittees and all the rest of it.

But what my colleagues find lacking is just little simple things like a master calendar, like structuring subcommittees within the full committee so we have meaningful work assigned at least to one of every two committees we have, and, if the committees can work so they are scheduled on, let us say, Monday/Wednesday or Tuesday/Thursday for their hearings, we would not be caught, as I was one day, with the three committees of the four I am on, on subcommittees, two full committees, are all meeting at 9:30 a.m. in the morning.

There is a simple way to deal with it. They have dealt with it at the State legislative level. There is no reason we cannot deal with it at the House level.

Mr. DREIER. I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] for his helpful contribution, and I would argue that with 266 committees and subcommittees between the House and the Senate it is obvious that the best way for us to deal with this is to try and reduce the number of committees and subcommittees so that we do not have these extraordinary demands for time which leave Members to simply go to a committee hearing, demonstrate their presence, stay for no more than 5 or 10 minutes, and then leave and go and demonstrate their presence in another committee hearing.

So, Mr. Speaker, my friend is absolutely right, and I thank him for his contribution.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], my very good friend, the chief deputy whip who worked long and hard with us on our work on the Joint Committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for having yielded, and I thank him for taking this special order on congressional reform.

As my colleagues know, one of the things that really should disturb us as Members of Congress is the fact that recent public opinion polls have confirmed again that Congress is still held in very low esteem by the American people. In fact, the most recent polling data is as bad as it was a couple of years ago in the midst of the check-kiting scandal which demonstrates that the public believes that Congress has done nothing to try to reform itself after a series of mind-boggling scandals.

□ 1400

The reason why the public can feel that way is they are right. We have not done very much. Oh, we cleaned up the bank situation a little bit. We did manage to get a professional into the Post Office after that erupted. The reform that we did in terms of appointing a House Administrative Officer has, in fact, been undermined by the higher ups who run the Congress by not giving that Administrator all of the powers that he was supposed to have in the beginning and, in fact, undermining his authority in some of the places where the power was turned over to him, so that that one has not worked very well.

Then the procedural reforms, the things that were supposed to be done to clean up the legislative process, were assigned to a bipartisan committee that was supposed to give us a blueprint for reforming how the House conducts itself. That has turned into an effort which is being buried in back rooms of the Congress at the present time.

Mr. DREIER. If I could reclaim my time, I would like to ask my friends and my colleagues on the Joint Committee and my friend from Long Beach if he would like to, as we were the other evening, talk about some of the areas where we focused specific attention.

One of the key items, of course, has been proxy voting whereby Members of Congress are able to have their votes cast when they are not even in the room. We know it is a violation of the law, the rules of the House certainly, to have your voting card used by someone else here, yet in committee it is used over and over and over again. I wonder if my friend from East Petersburg might spend some time talking about this issue of proxy voting where he spent a great deal of time.

Mr. WALKER. That is one of the more disturbing patterns that has been built up over the years, in large part because of the practices the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN] referred to. We have gotten ourselves into such a bizarre committee pattern in the Congress that we now justify people not showing up at committee because the schedule is so bizarre. So if they are not going to show up, you have to have some kind of way to conduct the business. So we have put into place a practice that allows people to vote without being there.

In most cases in the country, people who do not show up for work, that is a bad thing. Here it has gotten to be a practice where some people regard it as a good thing. As a matter of fact, it extends the power of committee chairmen to be able to sit there with a whole sheaf of votes in their hands and conduct the practice kind of regardless of what else is going on in the room.

It is horrendous to watch in committee meetings situations where the people in the room, having listened to the arguments presented on an amendment will vote one way only to have their vote reversed by a group of proxy votes that are cast against the will of the people who are actually there and voting. It makes for very bad legislating. It makes for a kind of situation where the House is not being a truly representative body and, in fact, it is a body designed strictly for a handful of power brokers who want to use proxies as a way of retaining their power. It is an outrage, I would say to the gentleman, and it ought to be corrected.

Mr. DREIER. Absolutely. If I could reclaim my time, there are many people here who say if we were to eliminate proxy voting, it would not work. My response to that clearly is, "Baloney." I sit on the Committee on Rules.

If I am not up there on the third floor casting my vote, my vote does not count at all. No one can carry my proxy up there because we do not allow proxy voting. If one sits on the Committee on Appropriations, proxy voting is not allowed on the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. WALKER. The Committee on Appropriations is the most powerful committee in the House. They do not allow proxy voting.

Mr. DREIER. Exactly.

Mr. WALKER. Why? Because they expect the people to be there doing the business of the country when they are making their fundamental decisions. That should be the case for every other committee. If we are going to join these committees and we are going to be a part of the work, we ought to be expected to be there when the votes are taking place. The fact is that what Members will say is, "I can't possibly be there with all the committee assignments." Fine. Then let us cut the committee assignments. Let us reduce the number of committees and subcommittees so people can be there doing the business. That can be done, too.

Mr. DREIER. The other evening the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON] talked about the fact that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs does not allow proxy voting. On that Committee on Veterans' Affairs, as he said, virtually every measure comes to the House floor under suspension of the rules. Why? Because every member of that committee has been able to work and have input in the final product which has emerged from that committee.

I should also say, interestingly enough, that in our Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress, we did not have proxy voting.

Mr. WALKER. That is right. People had to be there because they know there were likely to be a lot of tie votes, so it forces people to show up at the meetings. It is exactly the pattern that we want to have happen.

Mr. ALLARD. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ALLARD].

Mr. ALLARD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I was struck by the comments for our fellow colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], who talked about his experiences and what happened in State legislatures. We talk about proxy voting. There is one thing that frequently we do not run across in State legislatures. I know in the legislature I served in, again, one had to be there to cast his vote. We know that works. It contributes to the accountability. It makes people feel good about their elected body.

I just wanted to make that point while we were on that discussion.

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Madam Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Cape Girardeau, MO.

Mr. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend, the gentleman from California, for yielding.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania in his comments on proxy voting raises another issue of reform needing great attention, and that is the committee structure, most especially the subcommittee structure.

I do not necessarily think that we have too many standing committees of the House, although I think some modification in their jurisdiction should occur. But we certainly do have far too many subcommittees of the committees of the House that operate in conflict one with another in a scheduling way. Very often the committees in a scheduling way are operating in conflict with the activities here on the floor of the House.

Yesterday was probably the busiest day of the week here in the House of Representatives. We had a couple of very important appropriation measures on the floor; we had instructions to conferees on the crime bill. Yet the committees of the House were meeting intently yesterday afternoon. We were in the Committee on Agriculture in a markup of a bill having to do with the reorganization of the Department of Agriculture. The fact of the matter was that we would get very well focused there in the committee and be making some progress when the bells would ring and we would go piling out to run to the floor of the House where we would have to focus here, losing our focus there, and we did this a number of times yesterday afternoon.

I rather felt like most of my day had been spent running back and forth across the street. Of course, some productive things were achieved, but not as well as they could be. Of course, all of this brings into focus the need for a master schedule of the House of Representatives. We all serve on at least two committees, most of us do, depending on what the committees are, and a variety of subcommittees. We need to be here on the floor very often listening to the debate. I think with the use of modern technology, we could have a system of scheduling that would permit us in our committee responsibilities, our subcommittee responsibilities, and our responsibilities on the floor of the House to be much more deliberative and to have the opportunity better to participate in these different fora.

After all, we are the highest deliberative body in the country, indeed probably in the world, and because of a lot of these arcane practices, we are not, in fact, as deliberative as we ought to be.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield to me for a moment just to make one point, we had a huge screw-up on the floor here today where the Committee on Ways and Means is working hard on the health care bill, which most of us regard as one of the major measures for the Congress, and evidently misunderstood the bills for a vote, and most of the Committee on Ways and Means missed a vote on the House floor. It was on a motion to rise. It is not going to kill their voting record in terms of the substance of the vote particularly, but nevertheless they are going to show up as being absent on a vote when they were over there working doing a major bill. It is all because we have this major committee doing major legislation while there is another major bill, an appropriations bill, being debated on the floor. The schedules that we run are absolute absurdities, and it is created by an absurd structure that allows it to happen in the first place.

When we tried to get to those issues, we kept getting knocked down time and time again in the reform committee. It needs to be brought to the floor and discussed thoroughly.

Mr. DREIER. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Long Beach.

Mr. HORN. I think you both make an excellent point in the relationship between action on the floor of the full House and the various committees of the House. I have talked to a number of committee chairmen in the majority party about this, would it be possible for us to get back here on a Monday, have floor action maybe Monday, Tuesday, and Friday and committee action on Tuesday afternoon, all day Wednesday, perhaps Thursday.

□ 1410

The argument made by most of the chairs, who know a lot about human behavior in both parties, is that unless we have votes on the floor, the members of their committee will not return to Washington. They will stay in their district. You have to have something that forces them to come here and do their duty. Being absent too often on the floor is one thing that compels you to do your duty.

Mr. DREIER. Again, proxy voting allows Members to stay in their districts.

Mr. HORN. You have the point that the gentleman from Missouri makes, which is we run back and forth, losing time. I was in one of those hearings yesterday, the Joint Subcommittee on Government Operations, in there from 9:30 to 1:30. I had to leave before the last witness. We came over to the floor, I don't know how many times.

We were on the great issue, which is very important, of fresh versus frozen chickens, since a lot of frozen chicken is sold in California as fresh when it really is not. We had some excellent witnesses, the secretary of agriculture from California, Wolfgang Puck, the great chef in California, and yet we are

leaving to answer rollcalls. Two of my freshman colleagues, one Democrat, one Republican, put a pedometer on one day. Each clocked between 5 and 7 miles going back and forth around here. That is a tremendous waste of legislative time.

Mr. DREIER. But we do have some very healthy Members because of that.

Mr. EMERSON. If the gentleman would yield, you raise an excellent point. The proxy voting issue, if we eliminated it and required voting in person by rollcall in committees, and made the weight of rollcall in committee equal to that to which they are regarded here on the floor of the House, that would give Members the incentive to be here.

Plus we must say this also: Our job is to represent our people. We are elected to represent our people in the Congress of the United States. I do not know how we have arrived at the mentality that unless the House is actually sitting, that there is nothing to be done in Washington.

Actually, probably far more of the important work gets done in committee than gets done here on the House floor.

Mr. ALLARD. I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding. Talking about our scheduling, it was brought up legitimately that proxy voting, getting people to attend their committees, again, the number of committees gets to be a problem as far as scheduling is concerned.

If I remember correctly, in the report that we reported out of our efforts on organizing Congress, we had a mechanism in there where we could begin to reduce the number of committees. We limited the number of committees that Members could serve on. Then we also said if those committees failed to meet with a certain number of Members on that committee, that the Members had voted, so those who did not meet those membership requirements would cease to exist. In effect, we were saying the Members of this body would vote by selecting which committees they were to serve on. If the interest was not there for the committee, despite what the chairman's personal feelings were, and obviously there is not a chairman that did not want to keep that power, then that committee would have to go. I think that made a lot of sense. I am real disappointed we do not have that coming before our body.

Mr. HORN. If the gentleman would yield a minute, I wanted to finish up on what Mr. EMERSON said for a minute, with one idea that might help. If we published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the votes on each issue in committee, as we publish the votes before the full House of Representatives and the actions of the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, you would have a greater level of consciousness as to who is around here doing the work.

Being on a number of committees that have 25 and 30 people, I can tell you there are usually 5 or 6 of us, divided maybe 3 and 3, that are sitting there with the chairman and the ranking Republican listening to the witnesses and doing the work. And I think it would help if we published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD all those committee votes, which you do not have any other way of knowing what the votes are in committee, unless the trade press on a particular committee publishes them. It seems to me the American people have a right to know what their Representatives are voting on.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, my friend has just pointed to one of the very beneficial aspects of the report that has come from the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. We, in fact, do have a provision which calls for regularly printing the votes in attendance for committees in the RECORD.

I should say today there is nothing to prevent that at all. In fact, regularly when I or my colleagues, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. QUILLEN, or Mr. GOSS are managing the rules on the House floor here, we print in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the votes that have been cast in the Committee on Rules, and that can be done today. But under the recommendation which came from the joint committee, we do, in fact, call for a regular printing of those votes in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I think that is an important reform.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield, it seems to me we ought to talk about one other thing, too, that is very much on the minds of the American people, and that is the whole issue of congressional compliance, forcing Congress to live under the same laws other people live under, and particularly to live under the laws we pass for other people.

That was something that was the subject of much discussion in the Joint Committee on Organization. It is one where I think there was unanimity of agreement among the committee that we were going to have to deal with that issue. We did not always agree on exactly the substance of how it would happen, but I think both Republicans and Democrats came to the conclusion that was something that had to happen.

That is a part of the package and is something that by preventing the package from coming to the floor, we would not ever get to. What we hear by way of rumor is that some of our friends on the Democratic side might want to separate out that issue, because they understand that the country is concerned about it, bring it to the floor, call it congressional reform, and do little else.

Well, I suppose that would be a step in the right direction, but the fact is that what they are also talking about is something that is very weak. They are talking about one more set of discussions about whether or not we can do it. Many of us feel as though it is time for Congress to make very clear to the American people that we intend to live under the laws that we pass for other people to live under.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I do so to disagree with my friend from East Petersburg.

Mr. WALKER. Shocking.

Mr. DREIER. Well, it occasionally happens.

I happen to believe very strongly that Members on the other side of the aisle who are supportive of establishing an office of compliance which would make recommendations back to us as to what regulations we might consider imposing on ourselves, are simply using that as an excuse to claim they support congressional compliance when they really don't. And that is what I found during the debate that we had when we were in our markup.

There are many people who do not believe that Congress should have to comply with the laws that we impose on the American people, and more than a few of them would argue that because of, as my friend has said, the tremendous uproar out there among our constituents who are regularly saying, you in Congress should be forced to comply with the laws that you impose on us, they feel that pressure. So they want to hold up this extraordinarily weak provision for congressional compliance.

When we had our hearing up in the Committee on Rules just a few weeks ago, I got into a disagreement with my counterpart, Mr. HAMILTON, who was saying that he believed that if we were to implement this package, which established an Office of Compliance that would make recommendations, that we would have to comply with OSHA. But in fact that is not the case at all. There is nothing in there that says we would have to comply with the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which has imposed tremendous regulations and forced small businesses out of existence.

So what he said is that he hoped that the Office of Compliance would recommend that we comply with OSHA, and that we would do it. The fact of the matter is, this has loopholes and creates a tremendous opportunity for Congress to continue to exempt itself, and it is so weak that if they try to bring forward a compliance provision which simply includes what came out of that committee, I would be compelled to oppose it, because I do not believe in any way that that moves us in the right direction.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman would yield further, the gentleman has corrected me. He is right. I was wrong. We are not dealing with anything that the House could possibly pass and consider as real reform, and I thank the

gentleman for putting that correction on the record.

Mr. DREIER. I have to do that once in a while.

Mr. HORN. If the gentleman will yield, I stress that this is said facetiously and humorously. If we had to apply and comply with OSHA or EPA, the first thing they would do is come here and close the Longworth House Office Building. The result would be at least $1 billion or $2 billion required to house what we now house in the Longworth House Office Building.

That is exactly what small business collectively and large business in this country, and I might add universities, because I had plenty of OSHA inspectors at California State University at Long Beach, who would be crawling around here finding the usual mouse holes, rat holes, lousy wiring, and all the rest, and we would have to suffer.

□ 1420

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, I did not mean it facetiously. The reason I say that is that we need to recognize that the onerous regulatory burden which we impose on American businesses, on universities and others is so great that is has created many problems. And while I acknowledge it would be impossible for us today to comply with any of those regulations which are out there, outside of the beltway for entities that are not part of the Federal Government, the fact of the matter is, we should realize that. And when we have to face the kinds of constraints that they have to, we just might realize that some of the cost of regulation, the duplication of regulation and the tremendous imposition out there should be reduced. That really is my goal on this.

Mr. ALLARD. This is not a new idea about having Congress live under the same laws as everybody else. James Madison, one of the founders of our Constitution, wrote frequently and talked frequently about the hazards of having a legislative body exempt itself from the same laws everybody else has to live under and, in the process of doing that, that you set up an elite body. I frequently, as I think most of you hear from your local elected officials, talking about the burden of rules and regulations, whether they are elected to the school board or the city council or county commissions or even State legislators. One of the things that amuses me is some of the arguments that we hear from our own colleagues.

They say, No. 1, that say we do not want those regulators in our offices. Well, they are beginning to get the idea.

Then the second argument they make, we cannot afford all those rules and regulations. I said, now you are really beginning to get the idea. That is why your city council people and your county commissioners, State legislators are having so many concerns, because you really do not understand about the impacts you are having on their local budgets.

Mr. WALKER. Just think about all the problems that we had when Congress all of a sudden awoke and figured out that we had to comply with parking laws that we passed in the last Congress, that we passed this, what I regard as a rather stupid law, that suggests that we are going to tax parking places at work. And the rest of the country is about to awake to this and find out that it is going to get real expensive for them.

But when we figured out that we had to comply with this, we have now scrambled around and the administration committees in the House and the committees over in the Senate have now figured out ways to comply exactly but to figure out how we escape the law, how we can bring the threshold of our parking places underneath what it would really be to comply.

It is exactly the kind of thing that the American people are concerned about. Once again, we found out a law applied to us and we scrambled around trying to figure out how we could make it so it did not apply to us. It boggles the mind.

Mr. HORN. You are precisely correct. I would suggest perhaps a law we all ought to cosponsor and pass would be that we require all Members of Congress to come with their tax records, find space in this Chamber over 2 specific days and have to make out their own tax forms with no benefit of accountants. I think that would do more to get the consciousness raised around here for the need for tax simplication.

Every tax bill I can think of since probably the 1940's especially 1986, started out with the idea of tax simplication. I remember when I was on the Senate staff 30 years ago, we called anything we passed in relation to taxes the lawyers and accountants relief act of still in the air, 1962, 1986, whatever. We ought to have to do it ourselves in this Chamber, no advice. And then you would know what people go through.

Mr. EMERSON. I just want to add to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania has said. He highlights the fact that the liberal majority there knows no bounds to what they would like to tax. Now they are going to tax the parking spaces of all Americans, and it has come home to us, because we are going to be taxed on our parking spaces here.

I suggest the simple solution would be that we would pass a law declaring that parking places are a perk that all Americans should enjoy, and it is a benefit of one's job. But the gentleman is absolutely right. Certainly, that would be true in this mobile society in which we live today. The gentleman is absolutely right.

We think that we know so well what is right of everyone else but do not make them applicable to ourselves. And when we do make applicable to ourselves the laws that everyone else is under, we have a much finer appreciation of the problems that Main Street America faces.

Mr. WALKER. What we end up with is, we begin to end up with recognizing the stupidity of what we have passed. All of a sudden it now occurred to people that if you put in action the kind of thing that we are talking about, it would not do what it was purported to do. And that is to help the environment. This is supposedly a way of getting people out of their cars and helping with the environment. Now we have figured out that what it is going to do is cause people in our garages to drive around for half an hour or better trying to figure out where they can find a place, thereby polluting the air more and causing all kinds of environmental problems. So the law in the face of it has turned out to be the ultimate stupidity, and we only recognize that because we are confronted with it ourselves.

Having recognized it, I wish we could repeal the law but there are all kinds of people out there who say, you cannot do that. We passed this law. It is a major reform law. I do not know who it is reforming. Too much reform becomes deformed. I think that is the case in this case.

Once having to look at the law as it applies to us, we found out it is pretty dumb.

Mr. DREIER. I wanted to take a couple of minutes to talk, if I might, about the specific area that I tried to get into the other evening but when the bewitching hour of midnight hit, I was unable to proceed.

I want to talk about the issue which was focused on more than any other during those 37 hearings of the joint committee, and that happens to be this question of committee reform. I would like to take some time to offer some quotes that were offered in testimony as we went through this hearing process.

Norman Ornstein, who is at the American Enterprise Institute and led, along with Thomas Mann, the renewing Congress project, Thomas Mann from the Brookings Institute, spent a great deal of time looking at this institution. He said that the committee system is the linchpin in the deliberative process.

As we look at other quotes that came from the testimony, former Senator Bill Brock, who is a very good friend to many of us, in fact a candidate for the U.S. Senate, I hope he wins, in Maryland, he said, "The way committees are organized now does not relate to the world in which we live."

Mr. Mann said, "The problem is fractured attention, superficial engagement in issues, scramble over turf, unrepresentative memberships on committees, concentration of jurisdiction on major committees. The only way to deal with that is through a process of consolidation."

The Carnegie Commission in February 1994 said, "Encroachments of committee jurisdiction originally justified as response to extraordinary circumstances have become routine. Consequently, authorizing committees which focus on programmatic legislation and oversight have lost the power to appropriations committees, which center on fiscal issues. Incomplete information and inadequate awareness of broader concerns sometimes results in multiple committees and subcommittees in Congress working at cross purposes."

The former Vice President, Walter Mondale, now Ambassador to Japan, when he testified before the joint committee said, "Looking back on my years as a Senator, I now realize the tremendous amounts of time I spent on matters that did not really advance the broad national purposes with which this institution should be concerned above all else. I believe that since then the problem has gotten to be much worse."

He went on to say, "Both the numbers of congressional staff and the proliferation of committees have reached proportions that are unwieldy and counterproductive and each tends to reinforce the other."

□ 1430

He said, "If you look at the committee structure, a lot of the priorities were set 50, 60, sometimes 100 years ago," and this is not necessarily the same Nation with the same problems as it was then. He said also, "There was a time when Congress could tap into a deep reservoir of public trust. Now the well is nearly dry."

As we look at the proliferation of committees, it has been unbelievable to see the overlap. There are 52 committees and subcommittees which have responsibility over programs that deal with children and families. The Environmental Protection Agency answers to 90 committees and subcommittees.

There are 107 committees and subcommittees which have jurisdiction over the Pentagon. More than 40 committees and subcommittees have jurisdiction over surface transportation.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency oversight is so splintered that no single authorizing committee is capable of examining that agency in totality. It is not uncommon to see conference committees that exceed 200 participants.

Clearly, Madam Speaker, the existence of this gridlock and a lack of fairness and accountability are reflections of the inability of Congress to deliberate, which is our goal. Accountability and enhancing the level of deliberation is critically important. This antiquated committee system which, as my friend, the gentleman from Long Beach, CA, said earlier, was put into place nearly 50 years ago with the work of the Monroney-LaFollette committee needs to be changed.

In the early years of this country there was a regular shift of committee. In fact, when the census was taken, this institution would look into bringing about changes in the committee system.

I appeared on a television program with my counterpart, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON]. This was last fall, and he said, "When I first came to the Congress some 30 years ago, there were no committees charged with dealing with issues like the environment. We have seen this increase in the numbers of committees to deal with those issues, and yet, there has been no commensurate reduction in committees that are dealing with other areas."

It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that we have a responsibility to look at a change of committees and priorities in this Congress on a regular basis. As we have witnessed throughout the world the incredible changes which have taken place over the last half century in communications, in transportation, in a wide range of other areas, it seems to me that we have a responsibility to bring the U.S. Congress into the 21st century.

If we do not modernize the committee system now, this House may drift for years without resolving the major cause of gridlock, which is in this institution. That is one point that I know my friend, the gentleman from Cape Girardeau, feels strongly about.

While many of the recommendations that come from the Joint Committee call for us to punt to others to deal with these issues, we are really abrogating our responsibility; because we as a committee, the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress, were established with a specific charge to address and make recommendations to the House and Senate of ways in which we could deal with these problems.

Clearly, Madam Speaker, the package which came from the Joint Committee, having spent all the time that we did with 14 proposals for committee structure reform that came to us from the Congressional Research Service, we basically did nothing on the issue of committee reform. In fact, here is the analysis that was given of that.

The New York Times said, "Regrettably, neither the Senate nor House Members addressed the sensitive matter of committee turf." Roll Call said that "the plan is nothing more than a mouse."

Thomas Mann, in looking at the package we reported out, said, "The idea that there have to be these sort of minor committees as fiefdoms to protect constituencies and careers is an old-fashioned idea that I think doesn't fit with a contemporary Congress."

James Thurber, from the American University, said, "I think this bill is the mouse that roared when it comes to committee reform."

Roger Davidson, who testified a couple of times before us from the University of Maryland, used to work here, said, "The most distressing gap in H.R. 3801 is its failure to address the structure and alignment of committee and subcommittees."

We had a recommendation that came to us from the renewing Congress project, that as I said was led by Tom Mann and Norm Ornstein. Unfortunately, we ignored that. I mentioned the 14 different plans that were outlined, and in fact, through our hearing process, sat in front of us as we asked witness after witness about the need for committee structure reform.

Time and time again they said, "Yes, we should do it." However, as my friend, the gentleman from Long Beach, CA [Mr. HORN] said earlier, "There are too many people in this institution who thrive on the status quo, creating a situation which makes it very tough for us to bring about reform."

As he said, we have today 117 new Members of the House of Representatives, 13 new Members of the U.S. Senate, most of whom in 1992 ran on this platform of change, reform, and, unfortunately, many of them have come here and done very little to address it.

However, I still hold out hope, as we look at the fact while there is this great hue and cry for term limits, come January 1995 we will see probably half of this institution having served for two terms or less, it seems to me that we will have more reform-minded people here. So if we do not get this package reported out this year, I hope very much we will be able to do it next year.

Madam Speaker, I happen to have offered, with the support of my friend, the gentleman from Cape Girardeau, and others on the committee, when we had our committee markup, the one overall plan which would bring about major restructuring of the committee system. It was not perfect.

In fact, I looked at some of the things and said, "Gosh, I would like to change those myself," and I have been in the process of changing those, so when we bring the committee package or the overall reform committee's package to the floor, I hope we will be able to consider committee restructuring.

Madam Speaker, I want to be able to offer that plan. However, as we look at the proposal that I offered to bring about committee structure reform, and as we look at other ideas to bring about changes, I would disagree slightly with my friend, the gentleman from

Cape Girardeau, and say that if we do make the mistake of cutting too many committees, we always have the ability to go back and make a determination that it is absolutely crucial that we have that committee. We can put it back into place.

My fear is that if we keep the structure the way we have it today, based on the way it was established a half century ago, we will not really get at the root of the problem.

Mr. EMERSON. If the gentleman will yield, I don't think we are far apart on this subject at all. What I said is, I think the Monroney-LaFollette committee did a fairly good job at the end of World War II in its recommendations on committee structure, which is what we have been operating under since about 1947, I think, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1947.

Madam Speaker, I would not quarrel that there should be some restructuring, some modification to bring us into the modern era. However, I was addressing the issue more from the standpoint that there is an understanding in the country that we are terribly overstaffed here in the Congress.

Staff breaks down several different ways. I think as to full committees, we need expert staff with the expertise that the major committees deal with, and certainly we as individual Representatives in our representative capacity do need staff to help us deal with—we all have at least a half-million constituents. We need a staff to deal with all of that. We cannot individually answer 300 to 500 letters a week, hard as we may try, and do all of the other things we have to do.

Madam Speaker, I think the level of staffing for individual Members is about right, and I do not take great issue with the full committee staffing, but subcommittees are a different thing. Let us not kid ourselves. It is a fact, you can read this in books containing political anecdotes, indeed, history, we have so many subcommittees in the Congress right now, in 1994, for one principal reason.

There was a tremendous class of freshmen Democrats who entered the Congress in 1975 following the Watergate fiasco, and there was a great need for a lot of people to be called Mr. Chairman. That is the reason we have so many subcommittees, not because there was any demand for the subcommittees, but because there were so many Members of the majority who did not really have a role to play and there was that great desire to be Mr. Chairman. You can go back and look at history as to when most of the subcommittees, probably a majority of the subcommittees that we have as subcommittees to the committees of the Congress right now were created in the period of 1975.

Mr. HORN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HORN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. The proliferation of subcommittees came as a result of that desire, but there is another factor we have not mentioned here.

We are too fragmented. It makes us inefficient, too much staff, which I think frankly we have on the majority side of the committees. If they want to share some of that with the minority, maybe I will not feel that way, but they have not. It has been a very selfish thing. There is no 2-to-1 rule as we have sought for years, with one-third at least minority staff. It will be interesting how they feel when they are finally in the minority and see their staff disappear, of 70 people versus our 7 or something.

□ 1440

The other point is we are also making the executive branch inefficient. When you have a dozen, two dozen, the gentleman cited even many more committees that the head of a particular agency has to testify before, interact with, what we are doing, and I have spent most of my life as an executive, we are just tearing these people apart, fragmenting them, keeping them from running their agency. Sure, they need to relate to Congress, but they do not need to relate to 12 committees of Congress.

Mr. DREIER. The gentleman is correct and the examples are horrendous. I was told once by a Cabinet Secretary that he came up here and would testify before three different committees, and he would often see the same exact members on each of those committees because they served on so many committees, and they would then go and ask different questions, or ask again the same questions for maybe a different television network that happened to be in the room at that time to cover it of that Cabinet Secretary. It is absolutely ridiculous to impose those kinds of constraints on the executive branch.

Mr. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. EMERSON. Madam Speaker, I think an excellent point is being made here by both of the gentlemen from California. They do need to structure things so that committees in the Congress somewhat mirror executive departments and agencies. A reason for this, in addition to those cited, the duplication of efforts and all of that, the Congress needs to do a better job in exercising its oversight functions. There we get into the whole budget process and the need for a 2-year budget cycle so we can spend 1 year doing what we do in authorizing, and another year exercising our oversight function to see if the programs, agencies, departments, policies of the Federal Government are indeed functioning in the manner intended by Congress.

Mr. DREIER. My friend is absolutely right on the need for oversight. That underscores another very important flaw in the package coming out from the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. H.R. 3801 calls for these incentive-based changes, and if on the whim of a Member of Congress they do not want to serve on the Judiciary Committee or on the Government Operations Committee, and those committees go out of existence, where would we be? Clearly this is an institution that has to have a Judiciary Committee, and clearly as we look at our responsibility to have oversight over the Pentagon and other agencies of the Government we cannot do it without some kind of committee charged with that. Yet based on this very flawed proposal that has come out, which does not really bring about a major structural reform of the committee system, instead, just saying gosh, if it is a popular committee and Members politically believe that it is going to be beneficial to them as they look at reelection in their district, then they will join that committee. If a committee is unpopular, it would go out of existence.

I think there are some constitutional questions that need to be addressed here, and that is why I think that rather than simply having the existence of a committee based on the whim of the membership, we need to look at our constitutional responsibility. That is why I am very insistent on moving ahead with the package that I have for complete structural reform, and I hope very much that we will be able to do that.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DREIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, the most popular committee in this Chamber, on which I happen to serve, is the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. We have an outstanding chairman. It is probably the only bipartisan committee in this House. We function on a bipartisan basis. It is a very progressive committee. It has come forth with trying to integrate transportation. My colleagues remember the so-called ISTEA bill, an intermodal.

Mr. DREIER. Does the gentleman think it is more bipartisan than the Rules Committee?

Mr. HORN. About 3,000 percent.

But the problem is we do not have all of the pieces. If we go to the other body there is integration on these pieces. We have a separate Merchant Marine Committee, so unless the bill is referred to us, jointly, which often it is, then that means fragmentation. We cannot deal with the railroads because they happen to be under Energy and Commerce, so we do not deal with railroads. So we are dealing with surface transportation, we have a part of the EPA jurisdiction, water resources, the environment and so forth, and aviation, but we

do not have an integration in our own body of where we can look and relate to the different modes of transportation, and that is very sad.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for that very helpful contribution.

Madam Speaker, we come to the end of this hour, and again we have just scratched the surface on the issue of congressional reform. I believe very strongly that we need to move forward as expeditiously as possible to meet the demand of the American people to bring about major reform of the U.S. Congress. I am counting on the majority leadership to do that for us.

I thank all of my friends on the committee as well as my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN], for joining us.

HAWAII PREPAID HEALTH PLAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Madam Speaker, I wanted to have this opportunity during special orders to discuss the Hawaii prepaid health plan. It is so often made reference to in various debates and forums that I wanted to take this time to clarify some of the points that have been recently discussed.

If we will recall back to September 1993, we will remind ourselves that in the inauguration of President Clinton's national health care reform there was considerable mention and identification with what the Hawaii prepaid plan was, and how it operated, and its most important ingredient was the employer mandate concept.

The State of Hawaii has been unique in that. We have had a health care reform program for the last 20 years. It took effect in June 1974, and it has been in effect since then.

People who are not aware of the controversy and the debate that occurred at that time of its enactment would probably think Hawaii being unique and different that the whole idea of a health plan simply breezed through the legislature without any controversy. That is not true. An examination of the news reports and the controversies during that time indicate that there was fierce debate, fierce objection on the part of the small business community and others rejecting the idea of mandates almost as heavily as we are being lobbied today in the Congress against the mandate concept.

Nevertheless, the legislature did not budge, and in 1974 Hawaii was the first in the country to enact a comprehensive, universal type health plan. And we have developed it to such an extent that we are extremely proud of its implementation.

There are differences between the Hawaii plan and the one that the President has unveiled and is now under debate. While it is an employer mandate plan, it was a mandate of the employers to cover only the worker, only the employee, not the dependents. It excluded those workers who worked less than 19 hours per week. So in a sense one could argue that it is not universal. It was not universal at its onset. But in the years intervening over the 20-year period it has become customary for the businesses not only to cover their employees, but also to offer coverage to their families.

As a recent GAO report indicated, and our colleagues have all seen this report I am sure, a thorough audit and analysis of the Hawaii health plan, the GAO says that notwithstanding the fact that the employer mandate only required coverage of the employee, not withstanding that, somewhere between 93 percent and 96 percent of the population of Hawaii is now covered under an insured plan of some variety. The State of Hawaii itself in doing its own audit has released a report which shows that it is not between 93 percent and 96 percent coverage, but it is more in tune with 98 percent coverage.

Whatever the percentage of coverage, it is the best in the country. It is the most comprehensive. We have reached the goal of universality to the highest degree of any other State in the Union. And this has been accomplished by an employer mandate concept.

□ 1450

I believe that the President's recommendation for employer mandate has been borne out by the experience of my State. The very small businesses who objected so strenuously against an employer mandate only to cover the employees moved very quickly to offer coverage to the dependents.

One of the other major differences of our State plan is that the percentage of contribution by the employer was limited at 50 percent. It was a 50–50 arrangement. Over the years, we have found, and the Hawaii chapter of the National Federation of Independent Businesses verifies the fact, that most of the businesses paid 100 percent of the employee's premium even though they are not required to. They fought the mandate. They find now it is more convenient to just simply pay the whole premium not only for the employee but also for the employee's family.

And this is how we have achieved nearly 96–98 percent coverage of our population in the State of Hawaii, and why we are so pleased with what we have been able to accomplish.

Now, one would say Hawaii is a very high-cost area. Our land prices soar out of any chart that you can imagine; food is expensive; housing, whether it is rented or ownership, is very expensive. Our taxes in general are very expensive.

And yet the GAO in its audit report found that we have one of the lowest in the country of health care costs of the insurance premium, of the utilization of any type of cost-shifting mechanism that we have heard so much about.

The utilization of our emergency rooms is low. The utilization of our hospitals is low. The secret to all of this, which is a principal cardinal point of the President's whole thesis, that if you can achieve universal coverage and if your health plan is based upon benefits being extended for preventive care, then in the long term, and Hawaii has enjoyed that long term of 20 years' experience, you will see that the premiums that need to be charged in order to cover the cost of the plan are lowered considerably. The excessive costs in the emergency room are spared, and the utilization of hospital beds even has been reduced extensively.

So we are very proud of the 20 years of accomplishment of our health care plan, and we are pleased to know that its success was used as a cornerstone in drafting the President's program.

Let me give you some of the other interesting statistics. Hawaii has the lowest infant mortality in the Nation, grouped together with some of the New England States. It has the lowest rate of premature mortality for heart disease, one-third lower than the national average. In cancer, one-fourth lower than the national average. In lung disease, half the national average, and a whole plethora of statistics that are similar to that list.

This has been compiled by the State of Hawaii in looking at our overall health system. The 20 years of experience has taught us many things, and we wish that we were able to convince the Congress and all of the committees on the things that it ought to be doing which we have done already in the State of Hawaii. But that is not possible. We are only beginning to create a system here for all of the people of the United States, and in doing so, the people of Hawaii feel very strongly that having had 20 years of experience in operating and implementing a system, that it would be grossly unfair to say to the people of Hawaii, "Dismantle your system, retrogress, even if your system is superior, has greater benefits, greater safeguards to your population, fall back, go back to the lower, less beneficial provisions of the national legislation," and we think that is grossly unfair.

So the other day in committee, I offered an amendment. I serve on the House Committee on Education and Labor that has been dealing with the President's bill over the last 2 months. We hope by next week to have finished our bill and to be able to report it to the House itself. We will certainly be the first committee to have accomplished that.

And so in the process of concluding deliberations on this legislation, I offered an amendment which the committee accepted which would, in effect, allow the State of Hawaii to decide by submitting an application to the national board not to be part of the system.

To be absolutely sure that we are not trying to get out of a national law, because we do not want to fall within its requirements, we have provided in the waiver provision that the employer mandate provision must be at least as good as the national bill, that the comprehensive benefit package must be at least as good as the national legislation, that the guarantees of universal coverage shall be at least as good, and certainly not less than, the national average, that we will impose a quality control mechanism to make sure that the quality of health care that we are providing in the State is at least as good as is being required under the national law, and that the data system which is being required to be kept under this bill will be put in place in my State, and that we will have also imposed cost-containment measures. We want to be sure that, in offering the State an opportunity to opt out of this national program, that we are not saying we are going to have anything less than what is in the national law.

The reason, the only reason, that the State is being offered this unique opportunity to opt out, to seek a waiver, is because we are far ahead of anything that the bill could have provided, because we have had 20 years of experience. It simply is not fair to the State of Hawaii, which has had 20 years of experience in implementing this program, to be forced to retrogress, to give less benefits, to give less assurances and safeguards to its population, because national law has now come and preempted.

It has been the tradition of the Congress in all of the areas where we have imposed standards in environment and clean water and so forth to say to the States, "If you have better laws, if you have better requirements, if you have better ways of assuring that the objectives of the legislation can be carried out or have been carried out, then the laws that have been enacted on a local level take precedence, and you are not superseded by Federal legislation," and this is all that I was attempting to indicate by offering my amendment.

Hawaii has had 20 years of experience. It has implemented universal coverage in a very unique way, and it has achieved about 95–98 percent coverage of its population in the course of time, and it would be a shame, merely because the national system which is seeking to accomplish those very goals, sets off on a different mechanism or a different plan, to force the State of Hawaii to have to dismantle, retrogressing back and start all over.

It is true that many States are beginning to discuss, beginning to develop their new systems. But the important point to recognize is that they have not yet implemented a statewide program as we have done in the State of Hawaii, and, therefore, they are simply in the process of development, and since they are in the process of development, they could very easily accommodate their own plans and proposals to make sure that they fall within the guidelines of the national program.

The most important thing, if we did not have this waiver, is the protection that we now have in the State law, and I have talked to the leadership, I have talked to people in Ways and Means and my committee; no one buys into this concept, and what it is is that in our law we state absolutely categorically that no worker can be required to pay more than 1.5 percent of their paycheck toward the premiums of the health care plan to which they subscribe.

This means that if a worker earns under minimum wage, about $10,000 a year, all they have to contribute toward their health care premium is $150. That is far less than the 20 percent that the legislation that we are considering would require them to pay.

□ 1500

They may not be in the poverty categories, and there are some poverty criteria which would enable them to have a subsidy, but we want to be sure that those kinds of protections that we now have as a result of 20 years of experience and the need to protect low-income workers in our State are not jeopardized because in the national legislation we have to deal with broader generalities.

Also, in the retired community, in the public sector retirees, they are protected by the Government paying 100 percent of their premium. Under the current legislation they would be required to pay 20 percent and the Federal Government or the State government would be required to pay the 80 percent.

It would be a tremendous burden on the retirees who at the time of retirement thought that that was a contract they were making which would carry them through all their years of retirement. But it could be superseded by this national law if we did not have the opportunity to offer the State to seek an exemption.

The amendment that I offered does not create an exemption, it merely offer the State an opportunity to do so. There are many reasons why a State may not exercise that option. One would be that if they did exercise that option, they would not be able to enjoy the Federal subsidies that the bill that we are now considering, at least in the Committee on Education and Labor, would offer to certain categories of small businesses.

So we would have to factor that in, to decide, "Do we really want to be out of this system when there is this opportunity for Federal subsidies coming in?"

So, to my friends on the other side of the aisle I say there will probably be a tremendous debate on whether we should stay in or out. One of the considerations would be the loss of the subsidy. So, for my friends on the other side of the aisle who might say they should opt out because it would cost less because the Federal Government would not have to participate in the subsidy programs which we have provided in our legislation, but I believe the idea of recognizing the State of Hawaii for its 20 years of experience and implementation of their health plan is a genuinely sincere effort on the part of my committee at least to recognize that we have gone far in this program and that we ought not to be prejudiced or forced to dismantle it in any way merely because we are so far ahead of our time.

Madam Speaker, I am happy at this time to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for taking this special order. I think what I would like to do, almost, is to engage in a bit of a colloquy on this because, as the gentlewoman indicated, we have more than 20 years of experience in this.

I thank it is very important that we do not find ourselves with the RECORD being printed about the remarks that the gentlewoman made or the remarks that she referred to about Hawaii receiving, in effect, special treatment by way of this opt-out amendment, that we refute, this; that only the contrary, what the amendment the gentlewoman offered in committee seeks to do is to indicate that we do not want special treatment for Hawaii. Rather, we do not want to be discriminated against for what we have accomplished.

It is quite the opposite.

Now, if some Members of the body are willing to provide for their constituents less than what we already have in Hawaii, I suppose they could have that prerogative. If they want to stand up and offer an amendment in the gentlewoman's committee or in the Committee on Ways, and Means or anywhere else which says, "My constituents will have less than everyone else is already having provided for them in law," I presume they could be our guests to do that. Presumably, they could go back to their constituents and say, "Well, we don't intend for you to have the same benefits that Hawaii has provided for more than 20 years." That would be their prerogative, would it not?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Well, the launching pad, I think that is what my

amendment has offered opponents of the President's plan, my amendment has offered them a launching pad in which to offer these amendments, which was done the other day by Mr. HOEKSTRA of Michigan, to say that, "Well, there ought to be a referendum, then, in each State as to whether they want to belong or be part of this whole idea." What is wrong with such a suggestion is that we are now debating a national health plan; we are attempting to see national standards, national norms, national formats for participation, national guarantees of consumer rights and so forth. It is to be a national plan where there are certain standards and requirements that each State must come up to within a 2- or 3-year period.

What we are saying with our amendment is not to relieve us of these standards and requirements but, on the other hand, to say that Hawaii has achieved all of these or will achieve all of these by new enactment; because if they do so, there are other ramifications that the congressional law cannot possibly adopt because it is so progressive and so far advanced that surely the Congress does not intend for Hawaii to dismantle it.

That is really where we stand today, and I thank the gentleman for his question.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. If I may go just a bit further, in order to explicate what it is that is being offered in the gentlewoman's amendment, all of it is conditional, that is to say Hawaii is not coming forward and simply stating or asserting that it has some superior version. On the contrary, the gentlewoman's amendment makes very, very clear that unless the most stringent adherence of the concepts is made manifest in the national law are adhered to, unless every element of the national law which is in fact progressive, which is leading to better health care for all Americans, unless every single point is matched or better than matched in the Hawaii law, Hawaii would not be eligible for such an exemption.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. That is exactly right.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. In fact, does not the gentlewoman's amendment also indicate and state explicitly that the most stringent elements of examination as to whether it is being met will be put into place?

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Exactly. And we will have a constant review every 5 years in order to meet these requirements. It will not be a simple adjunct effort on the part of Hawaii to qualify.

As I said during my remarks, our current law only covers the employees. The State legislature will have to go into session and amend the law and cover all the dependents of the worker. They must do that. Why I believe it is such a simple thing for the State to do it and that they will do it is that even without the mandate our companies have already covered the families and their dependents.

The second thing they are going to have to change is the 50–50. We now say to the employers, "You pay 50 percent of the premium, and the employees pay 50 percent." In truth, as I said in my earlier remarks, the employers are paying about 100 percent of the premiums. That is not going to be a big barrier, but they will have to go to the legislature and fix that because all of the bills we are talking about are about 80 percent by the employer and 20 percent by the employee. Failure of Congress, however, to create a protective floor for the low-wage worker is what is causing me to feel the pain about this less progressive provision, because in Hawaii, as I said, a low-wage worker does not have to contribute more than 1.5 percent of their payroll. We do not have that safety in this legislation.

So our workers who are low-wage workers are going to have to pay much more of the premiums than they currently do. And that is unfair because our system has worked. We have implemented it, and I do not see any reason why we should be forced to cause greater pain on our workers than is already the case through a voluntary system that the employers have adopted.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. So the facts are this: More than 20 years ago all of the same arguments were being made, virtually word for word, all of the same kinds of fears and anxieties were being conjured up in order to prevent us from passing the initial legislation, and the initial legislation, therefore, passed in high hopes that those objections would be met and the experience of 20 years as opposed to the rhetoric of the last 20 weeks or so in Congress has been—not only were those fears unwarranted, not only were those anxieties of no substance, but the fact is that even though there was a requirement 20 years ago of only 50–50 participation, through collective bargaining, management has come to realize that 100 percent coverage is in fact a net advantage and that the only ones who are benefiting from the old system, probably more accurately I should say nonsystem, were those insurance companies who were seeking to make a maximum profit out of other people's pain and suffering and grief, who took all the middle-level expenditures out for themselves in terms of profitability so that there was no real choice and there was no real service to the consumer and the patient and the victims and there was no real choice with respect to the physicians, nor were the hospitals in any position to exercise more efficient management.

□ 1510

It was strictly those insurance companies that were in effect cherry picking the population for their own profitability that got, quote, hurt, unquote. That is to say, when the forces of competition came into play, under our law it turned out that the overwhelming majority of those people under the employer mandate were being offered 100 percent full family compensation with respect to their health insurance so that those then who are complaining today, who are saying that this will never work; the experience of Hawaii shows that those fears are completely unwarranted, that they are, in fact, trying to stop national health care because they know it works, and we have proved that it works.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. In Hawaii, Madam Speaker, I would say that most of the small businesses, small employers, are really not that aware or cognizant of the requirements of our Hawaii law. What they understand, and as a part of practice and custom over 20 years, is that coverage of health care is part of the normal course of business. Until this debate, Madam Speaker, one would never have heard anyone saying, "Oh, that's an employer mandate." It is a new word that has now come into the vocabulary, and I am somewhat startled because I get letters from small businesses, restaurants, who tell me:

"I don't want to change the system. I just want to be left alone. I now cover my employees and their families——"

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Right, exactly.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. "And we are happy, and I pay all their premiums, so don't give me this huge bureaucracy that's going to complicate matters and make it more difficult for us to stay in business."

So I respond to them and say, "In Hawaii," and maybe I should not have told them that, but, "under Hawaii all you need to do was cover your own worker, and all you had to do was pay 50 percent of the costs, except this 1.5 percent."

And he said, "You know, the national Government is not going to come in and do any more to you than what you are currently doing just as a matter of what is right."

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. And what is good business.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. And what is good business.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. And the reason for this, of course, is they help us stabilize the work force.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Exactly.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Because when people have a steady job where they know their health care needs are going to be met, there is a great likelihood of job satisfaction, and the ability of working with management is increased rather than decreased.

When we talk about welfare reform, Madam Speaker, I think my colleague would agree with my contention that the greatest single thing that we can

do to extend reform to the welfare system is to have national health care coverage. This is what enables people, along with child care and educational opportunities, to go into a job and not have to worry about losing those medical benefits they would otherwise have under the welfare system.

I ask:

Isn't this interesting? When we are keeping people from working, we know that we have to provide them with medical care. But when we remonstrate with them and say to them, "You have to go to work, you have to hold down a job," we take the medical care away, thus disenfranchising them from that very central element which enables them to have security for their family.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Let me add another startling fact to the marvelous achievement of my State.

Very early on, when we began the debate on national health reform, the opponents argued about this huge bureaucracy which would be needed to run the system. They were, of course, not aware that under Medicare, which is really part of our dialogue and our existence today, the overhead costs for Medicare is less than 2 percent.

So, even with the system we now have in Medicare, Madam Speaker, it has not been borne out that there is this huge bureaucracy, but in Hawaii, under the plan that they created, and I took a committee, several committees, out to Hawaii, because I knew they would not believe what I had to say on the floor of the House without examining this fact themselves, and each one of these individuals had the opportunity to investigate what I am about to say, and that is:

The enforcement mechanism, which was required to be put in place over these 20 years of operation of our health plan, is exactly two new employees, and I repeat that again. Two new employees were required to be hired in the health department in order to administer this program.

So, all the bugaboos and all the opposition arguments that have been made simply have not borne out in reality in my State. Businesses prospered by every criteria of examination, and this was done by the GAO to see what happened in that period of implementation. Did the business go bankrupt? How many shut? How many grew? And in truth of fact, Madam Speaker, my State has grown enormously with this protection for workers as a guaranteed benefit.

So, I urge my colleagues to follow the example of my State and, in doing so, lend support to the Clinton health plan because it is a necessary step in the furtherance of the quality of life of millions of Americans. Without it they are in jeopardy. Without it the success and prosperity of our Nation is in jeopardy. And so I hope that, without picking on my State for what it has accomplished and ridiculing our effort to stand up and say it as it is, and that is that we are so far ahead, while we support the Clinton efforts, we think that they are absolutely essential for the Nation to succeed and prosper, but, for heaven's sake, do not throw us backward in the process because we have achieved so much, and it would simply be unfair to ask us to dismantle our system while others are beginning theirs.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. I would like to say in my concluding observations that we would be more than happy to have the necessity for offering such an amendment be obviated by having a national health care plan pass which at a minimum offers at least as much as we have already achieved in Hawaii. There would be no necessity for us to anticipate the possibility, not the desirability, but the possibility, of having to take up such an op-out amendment if we pass national health care for the country at least as good as that which we have in Hawaii, and I think the bottom line observation then, I think, needs to be, and I think people need to ask this question of those who are opposing health care, throwing up obstacles to health care and the President's principals all across the country:

"Why are you trying to prevent? Why are you trying to prevent, why are you opposing, a national health care plan which does nothing more than present at least that which Hawaii has already achieved and has been operating with success for more than 20 years?"

That is the question that every American has to ask himself or herself, why is it that the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] and I have to come to the floor, have to do 1-minutes, have to meet with Members, have to go to committees and over, and over, and over again say, "Look, it's very, very simple. We have been doing it for 20 years. Can't we at least provide for the people of the United States, as a whole, that which the citizens of the State of Hawaii have already been enjoying for 20 years?"

Unless and until the insurance lobbyists, and, as the Washington Post says today, health lobbyists, they certainly are not health lobbyists because they do not wish good health to the people of this country, but at least until all those who are in opposition to national health care are able to answer that simple question: "Why can't we have a national health care plan that emulates at least what Hawaii has been providing for more than 20 years"; until they are able to answer that, what they really mean is that they are in the grip of private interests whose profitability and whose interests are not those of the American people, nor their health.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. The opportunity to allow the State of Hawaii at least to maintain the program benefits that they now have that are better than anything the Congress is going to enact is simply a recognition of the justice that is required by such action.

□ 1520

I hope that this House will take it under those auspices and give us the necessary recognition for being so far ahead in achieving what is simply fundamentally correct for all of the people of the United States.

I thank my colleague for joining me this afternoon.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF D-DAY AND OTHER EVENTS OF WORLD WAR II

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BYRNE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, and June 10, 1994, the gentleman from California [Mr. DORNAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, this is one of those periods in history when all week long we should be celebrating the 50th anniversary of stunning events that took place in World War II. We made a proper memorial out of D-day. It was almost too celebratory. Maybe the real celebration should be on Victory in Europe Day, which was on Harry Truman's birthday. The 50th anniversary of that comes up next year, on May 8. We should also celebrate the cessation of hostilities against Japan in the Pacific theater, which was August 15 or the signing of the surrender on the deck of the U.S.S. *Missouri* in Tokyo Harbor on September 2, 1945. Those can be celebratory days. D-day should have been more a day of memorial with a more somber tone the way the veterans were observing it over there. In other words, absent sad little silly moments like White House staff on the U.S.S. *George Washington* purloining 16 bathrobes and about 60 towels with the scotch crest of the U.S.S. *George Washington* on them. We must remember that Normandy was an 80-day battle.

Every day this week there was fierce resistance by the Germans on the whole British front around the city that was eventually completely destroyed, the city of Caen. On the American side beyond Omaha and Utah Beaches, BOB MICHEL, our minority leader was in combat for his 7th day. He arrived on Utah Beach D-day plus 4 days, so 7 days later, this is his first week of combat. BOB MICHEL, with his Browning automatic rifle, was a heavy rifle member of his squad. He made it through to the western coast of the Cotentin Peninsula, helping to cut off German divisions north and all the way to Cherbourg, which was the first port the Allies took later in the month, on June 29. German divisions asked all the way up to Adolf Hitler for permission to break out and to kill BOB MICHEL in the process. Hitler denied them the right to break out. Hitler said, in effect, "No, die in place."

Now, today, on June 17, Adolf Hitler came all the way to the famous World

War I battlefield of Saussaint a name that my dad had me memorize as a young child. Actually, I was to memorize Saussaint, Apre, Desomme, all the battlefields leading up to the American intervention in World War I in 1918. Then the names Chateau Thierry, Argonne Mues, Belleau Wood. Those names became more famous. The World War I devastated area looked like the surface of the Moon. There was incredible loss of life.

Hitler came to Soussaint and met with von Runstedt, the last of the old Prussian noble officers who knew nothing about involving, let alone murdering, civilians by the thousands. Hitler met with von Runstedt and Rommel himself, the Desert Fox, who was the commander of the Southern German Army Group with full responsibility for the Normandy area. They asked Hitler for certain tactical permissions.

Hitler went into a rage. This word jumped at me off the pages of several history books I was reading, because in Bob Woodward's book, he talks about our current Commander in Chief indulging in purple rages where the young George Stephenapolous is treated more like a battered wife than a Communications Chief. So I do not like to hear about people going into rages on their staff. For all of my tough image, crafted carefully by the L.A. Times, I defy someone to find a staffer that in almost two decades has ever seen me ever speak harshly to a staffer, let alone go into a purple rage.

But here is Hitler in a purple rage, calling the entire two German Army groups in the whole area of Normandy and above La Havre cowardly. Suddenly he is the Austrian, damning his own German soldiers, who were out fighting the British, the Canadians and the United States forces. In any unit where it was man to man, the Germans would always prevail. All of the great biographers, the late Cornelius Ryan, the current master of historical craft on D-day, agree with that assessment. By the way, I had the pleasure of sitting next to Ryan's wife and chatting with him in Great Britain in Grosvenor Square at the ceremony we had honoring Dwight Eisenhower. Eisenhower's great son General John Eisenhower was in attendance. I also spoke with historian Stephen Ambrose, and in his great book, "D-Day: The Battle for Normandy," he points out that in unit to unit size where the numbers were equal, the Germans would always prevail. And well they should since they had more combat general officers, combat-trained commanders at every level right down to the infamous commander of a Tiger tank unit, Michael Whitman. Isn't that an American-sounding name, Michael Whitman. He killed in his career 134 tanks, 130-some odd artillery pieces, 138 fighting vehicles, and countless other vehicles destroyed. This tank commander was finally surrounded and killed by Canadians.

Hitler was prevailing at every battle 50 years ago this week, Yet, Hitler is calling his forces fighting so fiercely cowardly. Purple rages do not do anybody any good.

Madam Speaker, I want to discuss some other areas of the world and say something for all of the veterans out there, and I am surprised at how many follow the proceedings of this Chamber. I had Adm. John Duncan Bulkeley, Medal of Honor winner, come up to me in the Colleville-Sur-Mer Cemetery. As I said last week, 172 acres of United States territory in perpetuity as a gift to us from France, and well the French should give us this soil since 9,386 Americans are buried there, including an American son of a President who died in World War I.

Admiral Bulkeley and most of his family, as did veteran after veteran, told me they watch these special orders and thanked me for being one of only a handful of Members, sometimes one of one, if I do say so myself, who remembers this period and brings it to the House floor, brings it to the benefit of people who visit in our galleries or read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or listen electronically, I hope it is over 1 million tonight.

Madam Speaker, I want to tell Americans about some history and some of the things, sort of a color commentary as though it were a sport event, that was missed by the three networks and CNN.

When I saw Admiral Bulkeley in the reception tent area behind that beautiful memorial to American youth who liberated France for the second time in a quarter of a century, I shook his hand. He was in full uniform, although he retired in 1988. August 31, 1988, was the retirement of Admiral Bulkeley after 58 years of service, if one includes his Annapolis time.

□ 1530

He graduated in June, the class of 1934. Just 2 days from now is the 60th anniversary of his graduation from Annapolis.

There was a terrible rumor, Madam Speaker, going around the Pentagon, brought to me by three young Naval officers, that Admiral Bulkeley had been selected as a Medal of Honor winner to throw the wreath off the U.S.S. *George Washington* at dawn, beginning the D-day commemorative events. The President was supposed to be there, and then the President was to go to Pointe du Huc with the rangers, then to Utah Beach, where the congressional delegation led by SONNY MONTGOMERY, our distinguished colleague and retired two star, was gathered. SAM GIBBONS, hero paratrooper of the 101st Airborne was reliving his own wonderful moments with his men and the British and Canadians and the 82d Airborne veterans.

Then the Presidential delegation would move up to Utah Beach, on the beach, and then up to Colleville Cemetery where they would be joined by the congressional delegation. But it was to start with Adm. John Bulkeley throwing a wreath into the English Channel.

These young officers from the Pentagon came to me and said they had received word that Hillary Rodham Clinton would be taking that honor from Admiral Bulkeley and that she would be throwing the wreath into the English Channel.

I was not there. We were on land. So I asked Admiral Bulkeley about it. I said tell me that Hillary did not take that wreath from you.

He smiled a wry smile, still with all the respect uniformed people have in the great tradition of our country for Commanders in Chief and First Ladies, and he said, "No, Congressman, I shared that honor with the President." And that night, on French television, I saw William Jefferson Clinton holding on to the wreath with Adm. John Duncan Bulkeley, Medal of Honor winner. A triple draft dodger and a Medal of Honor winner, both together, throwing the wreath into the English Channel.

Now, if the name John Bulkeley doesn't strike a resonant cord in your knowledge of history, young or older Americans, be advised he won his Medal of Honor for saving Gen. Douglas MacArthur and taking him off the island of Corregidor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BYRNE). I remind the gentleman he should not refer to the President using pejorative terms.

Mr. DORNAN. Using what?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pejorative terms.

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, "draft dodger" is not a pejorative term. It is historical fact.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is out of order, sir.

Mr. DORNAN. Madam Speaker, I appeal to the Chair or to the Parliamentarian. Someone who has dodged the draft is a draft dodger. It is a historical application of a title that is not pejorative, especially if someone was proud of it and bragged of it.

I will not say it again, Madam Speaker. It is not a pejorative term. It is a fact. A historical fact. but, I will not say it again.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed in order.

Mr. DORNAN. Now, let me tell you what Admiral Bulkeley did before he rescued General MacArthur from Corregidor and won the Medal of Honor and what he did afterward. First, I will tell you what he did afterward. He fought all through the South Pacific, on dozens of patrols, PT boat patrols. In the Air Force we would call these missions. He had dozens of combat missions.

Remember that John F. Kennedy, young mid-20's lieutenant, through no fault of his own, although that is contested, but I would say through no

fault of his own, in the darkness, dark running the Navy calls it, in the Slot, down the middle of the Solomon Islands, near Kolombangara Island, on his first mission, had his boat cut in half by a Japanese destroyer. Of the 13 men on his PT boat 109, two were killed. John F. Kennedy received the Navy Cross for rescuing one of his crew members, who was semiconscious, dragging him through the water to an island by his life preserver cord. That was a life saving mission, certainly worthy of a Navy commendation, but it had nothing to do with combat. It was not like going after the enemy or sinking a ship.

That was President Kennedy's first mission. His back was hurt so badly, he only had two or three more patrols along the coast, firing at a unseen enemy, and then had to be sent home because of his back pains.

Here was Admiral Bulkeley, also a lieutenant with hundreds of combat patrols. He was then chosen, to be the commander of all the PT boats in the Mediterranean for the Sicily invasion on July 10, 1943, and then for the naval invasions of Salerno, and then later Anzio, and then was picked to command 67 PT boats in the English Channel.

This is why he was asked as a Medal of Honor winner to throw the wreath into the English Channel on the morning of the 50th anniversary of D-day. Sixty-seven PT boats under his command. And what was their job? To keep the German PT boats, they called them E boats, from doing what they did in the last few days of April, when they killed hundreds of American men on transports, sank several ships that were training for the invasion off the beaches of England. German torpedo boats got into our practicing for D-day and killed, some reports say 649. I have seen other reports that they killed almost 1,000, drowning hundreds of young Americans who had been training in England for 2 years. And this operation, Tiger it was called, Operation Tiger, training for Operation Overlord, it was kept secret not only for the entire war, but then seemed to be lost after the war. And only until recent times, five decades later, are we acknowledging what the German E boats did, killing hundreds of Americans.

Someone asked Admiral Bulkeley at Colleville Cemetery, what was the principle duty of the PT boats under you, other than to keep the Germans from unfiltrating our landing craft and tearing up the invasion forces?

He said his boats were to block the Germans from coming from the west coast of the Cotentin Peninsula, the Cherbourg Peninsula, from coming around the top to try and block us from going near Cherbourg.

I asked the admiral if the Germans tested him? And he gets this wry smile and says, "Oh, yes, they did."

That is a naval battle that I have asked the Library of Congress to research for me and that I do not have yet.

Now, let us go back from the Normandy combat waters, the waters off Italy, off Sicily in 1943, let's go back to the dark days of December 1941, shortly after Pearl Harbor, and months before all of the intervening combat patrols leading up to rescuing, by direct order, of Gen. Douglas MacArthur who wanted to be captured with his men or die with his men on Corregidor.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt gave a direct order, you will leave. He ordered him to leave by submarine. MacArthur somehow or other felt using our silent service was leaving in some sort of ignominious way.

I would argue that with the great general. But he wanted to go out with flags flying. So he ran past Japanese cruisers, all the way from Corregidor to Mindanao, with a great Lieutenant Kelly in one PT boat, and soon to be Admiral but Lt. John Bulkeley in the PT boat that rescued MacArthur.

By the way, there is a great movie, now colorized, that I recommend young people, and not so young people. It is called "They Were Expendable," a classic John Ford film, where John Wayne plays Lieutenant Kelly, and Robert Montgomery, the distinguished actor and friend of President Eisenhower, plays Admiral Bulkeley. "They Were Expendable." And, believe me, everybody was expendable on the Bataan Peninsula and Corregidor, while we built up our forces to roll back the imperial warloads of Japan, the Fascists of Italy, and the Nazis of Adolf Hitler.

Now, here is a great book, a quick read, a small book, written by a fine author, William Brewer, entitled "Devil Boats." It is about PT boats. Kennedy only gets a page in here because he lost his boat on the first mission.

But here is "Devil Boats, the PT War Against Japan." This doesn't cover Bulkeley in the Mediterranean or the English Channel. Listen to this from chapter 23, the opening, entitled, "The wild man of the Philippines."

□ 1540

If you have seen that film clip again, maybe in 1996, of Clinton and Bulkeley holding the wreath to throw it in the English Channel, think of this description of Bulkeley and compare him to the man that we read about at Oxford in 1969 and 1970, demonstrating against his country in a foreign land.

When Lt. John Bulkeley reported to his Corrigedor headquarters, still designated grandly as the 16th naval district on January 18, he was handed a tersely written order by Capt. Herbert Ray, Admiral Rockwell's chief of staff.

"Army reports four enemy ships in or lying off Port Beneca," that is a Bataan port that we had lost earlier, "force may include one destroyer, one large transport. Send two boats, attack between dawn and dusk."

Returning to the U.S. base, this would be Bulkeley's base, at Sisiman Cove, Bulkeley began preparing for the night's mission. By now, his daring courage, seemingly unlimited supply of nervous energy, and his swashbuckling exploits had gained him a widely known nickname, "Wild Man of the Philippines." And chapters 1 and 2 talk about these exploits with six PT boats at first, then five and then four and then salvaging parts to keep a couple afloat.

A striking physical appearance strengthened that label, wild man of the Philippines. He looked like a cross between a bloodthirsty buccaneer and a shipwrecked survivor just rescued from months spent marooned on a desolate island. His shirt and trousers were soiled, wrinkled, torn. As I discussed with the admiral, covered with oil. He wore a long black unruly beard, and his green eyes were bloodshot and red-rimmed from endless nights without any sleep while out patrolling the coast of Bataan.

On each hit he carried a menacing pistol and he clenched a tommy gun in a manner that caused others to believe he was itching to locate a Japanese to use it on. Bulkeley indeed was a wild man.

For that night's raid, Bulkeley selected PT-31. Keep in mind that Kennedy's 109 came off the assembly line thus numbered, and he has got 31. And PT-34 was temporarily captained by an ensign, a second lieutenant, Ens. Ron Chandler, who would be pinch hitting for Lt. Bob Kelly who was hospitalized briefly in a Corrigedor tunnel with a serious infection. Again, Bob Kelly is the one that John Wayne played. And they were expendable. Kelly kept coming back and back, sick or not, to keep going into combat. You can imagine the PT boats that Bulkeley commanded, the 67 of them off Normandy for the D-day invasion were all numbered in the 700 and 800 series. That is how many we produced in 2 years with our industrial muscle, which is really what won the war. All praise Rosie the Riveter.

This story goes on to tell how they go up the coast, capturing Japanese barges. What they left out in that brief description was that he had the toes of his shoes cut off so he would not get jungle rot in his feet, no socks. His trouser were cut off at the knees like Bermuda shorts. The shirt had the sleeves ripped off. One officer confronted him and said, "Lieutenant Bulkeley, are you and I in the same Navy?" But he had just come back from killing personally a whole barge of Japanese soldiers, climbed up in the oil slick among the bodies of the dead Japanese naval marines and picked up a bunch of papers covered with oil and

soaked in water, and brought them back. They were examined at the headquarters at Bataan, and they were top secret documents outlining a kind of reverse MacArthur Inchon landing from the Korean war. The Japanese were apparently going to make a big right hook around us on the west coast of Bataan, cut off all our forces and caused the collapse of Bataan even sooner than it happened. And we were able to thwart that Japanese right hook invasion plan, thanks to this incredible officer.

Then he goes on to win the Medal of Honor, taking MacArthur and his family, Mrs. MacArthur, the children, off the island of Corrigedor. That was March 11. Bataan fell with its infamous death march, including the commander years later of the National Guard, the ROTC at the University of Arkansas, still alive and with us, Col. Eugene Holmes. He got into the controversy in February of 1992 with Clinton, candidate Clinton, and then in September wrote the letter that America still does not know about because it was ignored by ABC, CBS, NBC, CNN, the Wall Street Journal, everybody ignored the letter written by Colonel Holmes, one of the Bataan Death March survivors, a dozen or more men died in his arms in prison camp at Camp O'Donnell. He wrote the letter about why he did not think Clinton was qualified to be President of the United States. It was ignored by the media, September of 1992.

That Bataan Death March was after the fall of Bataan on April 9, and then the fall of Corrigedor on May 6. But inbetween my former friend, the great living legend that just died a few months back, Jimmy Doolittle, raided five major Japanese industrial cities on the 18th, 9 days after Bataan fell, 3 weeks after Corrigedor. That year of 1942 was an incredible year.

Now, about today, 50 years ago. I love the focus on D-day because it stimulates historical interest in young people. But I resent, along with veterans, that D-day has so much romantic impact attached to it. Because it was the greatest invasion in the history of civilization and it can never be repeated, given the massive killing power of stand-off weapons today. It was an 80-day battle so there is something to commemorate for today.

More Americans died this week than the week of the landings because the Germans were getting their act together. The 21st Panzer Division was on the attack.

One of the Orange County newspapers—people sometimes say to me, where do you get this memory? Hey, it is in the paper every day in the Orange County Register. It is an AP service. you ought to write to your papers and ask them to put this little column in that says "Today In History."

You will read that today is the anniversary of the Watergate break-in, the anniversary of Bunker Hill, the anniversary of the Supreme Court ending school prayer. June 17 is one of those days that attracted a lot of history over the years.

The article, the way they title it in the Orange County Register, is "Today In History."

I just grabbed a couple of them for this week because they feature World War II, 50 years ago today.

I misplaced the 11th, 12th, and 13th, but I pretty well know what happened on those days.

Listen to this. Two days ago, 50 years ago, two U.S. Marine divisions, it does not say what they are but I know it was the 2nd and the 4th, landed on Saipan. Saipan was to be a B-29 base to bring the imperial warlords of Japan to their knees. Before that Tojo had been fired, but he was replaced by, known only to deep historians, other killer warlords. But we landed on Saipan.

When we were through taking Saipan, more people had died on that Japanese island than had died among the less than 2,500 remarkable low KIA of Americans and Brits and Canadians and French commandos on the beaches of Normandy by midnight at D-day. This carved out secure footholds on the highland of Saipan, one of the Mariana Islands, despite being put ashore further apart than they planned. Two days later, today, the two Marine divisions joined up. And then we put in a National Guard Division, the 27th. The Army joins the Marines, as they did in Guadalcanal and later on in the bloody Pelaleu. What was happening in New Guinea, where Admiral Bulkeley had spent so many months in combat missions with his PT boat commanders, the real swashbucklers who, before Kennedy, got there and for a year after he left, fought before the island hopping started all along the north coast of New Guinea and the Admiralty Islands. It was an unbelievable campaign against Japanese naval forces trying to supply all of their enclaves across the north coast of New Guinea, totally unknown to American adults, let alone to American young people.

On Baik Island, bloody Baik like bloody Boona on the northern coast of New Guinea, the American soldiers repelled a ferocious Japanese attack. There is that word again. Ferocious German attacks against BOB MICHEL's 9th Division. Ferocious attack on the north coast of New Guinea repelled. And today the Americans took, 2 days later, the high ground above all the western caves just like the caves on Saipan, the caves on Iwo Jima. They found caves in New Guinea to dig themselves in.

□ 1550

That was not discussed on the college campuses of America.

I can remember as a ten-year-old kid that B-29 bomber in a big fold-out from Life magazine. It looked like something from outer space, this most gigantic bomber in the history of the world. Two days ago, 50 years ago, B-29 bombers flew their first mission in 1944, out of secret bases in China, what FDR would have called Shangri Las. Today, the Germans continued their buzz bomb offensive.

The V-1, V for vengeance which today we would call a cruise missile, flew its first mission the day after Normandy. Hitler did not even use them on the Normandy coast. He was after hitting school children and women and old people's homes and churches in England.

He launched it on June 7. On June 15, 8 days later, 144 V-1 vengeance weapons were launched, and today, 50 years ago, one hit outside a school, killing six across the English channel. So all this week and the end of last week was big V-1, vengeance weapon week.

By the way, Hitler ranted at Von Runsted and Rommel, calling their men cowards. He also brought up "I'm going to win this war with the vengeance weapons," because his scientists were lying to him about how soon they could get the V-2, the ballistic missile, on line, to send against Great Britain. The V-2 had no precision, it just hit whatever was under it when it came down. And in the case of a buzz bomb, the V-1 cruise missile, when the engine stops, a pulse jet, whenever the fuel runs out, down it goes, hitting any helpless women and children underneath.

Madam Speaker, that was the 15th. Here is the 16th, yesterday. American paratroopers fought their way across the Douve River and pushed into San Sauveur-le-Vicomte. I guess that means St. Savior. British forces captured Spoleto in Italy. That is coming up the eastern coast of the Adriatic across from Yugoslavia. The British 10th Corps was replaced today by the Polish 2nd Corps, free Polish, fighting with us in Italy, while the Russians are letting them die later on in the year as they wait outside of Warsaw to have all the Warsaw resistance fighters slaughtered.

We well remember in this Chamber, and I participate, the slaughter of European Jewry by Adolph Hitler. But keep in mind, Hitler killed as many Polish Christians as he did of Europe's Jews, of which 2 million or 3 million were Polish—decent, loyal Polish Jewish citizens.

In the Pacific, U.S. commanders delayed a landing on Guam until they dealt with approaching Japanese warships. Guess who was there in the Marianas to hit the Japanese forces? Former President George Bush, who, only 20 years of age, was flying his Grumman Avenger off the U.S.S. *San Jacinto*. By the way, that is the name of the Aegis cruiser that was in the English Channel last week when Clinton's

staff arranged those little rocks on the beach. They lined them up with the U.S.S. *San Jacinto*, named after George Bush's carrier, so Clinton could build them into a little cross. Rush Limbaugh caught him looking up to see if the camera was checking him out, all of that posturing, and there is the *San Jacinto* off the coast. Unbelievable.

Marines yesterday linked their beachheads on Saipan, the Guard division came in today. Meanwhile, the Nationalist Chinese troops are doing well in Kamaing, Burma. Meanwhile, the Japanese forces, in the last successful offenses in the Pacific, attack Changsha, China.

Now today, Madam Speaker, the 17th; continuing action on Saipan, continuing action at Biak, continuing action by all of the Allied forces in Burma. And today, with BOB MICHEL's 9th Division in the lead, we cut off the German forces on the Cherbourg Peninsula.

Madam Speaker, the other day I brought this little Bible out on the floor because this was given to me in the cemetery at Colleville, a tiny little red leatherette Bible that is a replica of a 1941 edition. I want this to be in the middle of my special order today.

On the cover in gold it says "New Testament." That would be politically incorrect today. This was printed with our tax dollars for the 50th anniversary of D-day. It says "Commemorative Edition, Normandy Invasion, 50th Anniversary."

You open it up, the first page says, "From the 1941 edition." On page 3 it says, "This commemorative New Testament is a joint production of the Pocket Testament League and the American Bible Society." Here I was, reading this in Normandy at the cemetery, "the White House, Washington, DC," over Franklin Delano Roosevelt's signature, 10½ months before Pearl Harbor, 1941, January 25th.

Franklin Roosevelt writes to the Armed Forces, to everybody:

> As Commander in Chief, I take pleasure in commending the reading of the Bible to all who serve in the Armed Forces of the United States. Throughout the centuries, men of many faiths and diverse origins have found in this sacred book words of wisdom, counsel, and inspiration. The Bible is a fountain of strength, and now as always, an aid in attaining the highest aspirations of the human soul.

If Roosevelt were writing this letter today, or any of us, we would not use the generic "man," we would say "men and women of many faiths." We would include the Old Testament, to be properly sensitive to our Jewish brothers and sisters. Could we even do it at all if this were not a commemorative edition? Probably not. I think somebody went out on a limb in the D-day Commemorative Commission to do that.

Madam Speaker, I was rushed in a short special order the other night about breaking away from the congressional delegation by myself, on D-day, after all the formal celebrations were over. Clinton had our buses blocked. He and Mrs. Clinton were shaking hands, working the crowd with all the GIs there, giving all the networks the opportunity to say the GIs fawned over him.

No, any young man wants to write home to his folks that he shook the hand of the Commander in Chief. It is totally different than what the veterans were telling me, and the people on active duty, when they recognized me and got me off to the side. They thought some of the ceremonies were highly excessive and focused more on image-building than it was on the veterans that were there. That will be argued for a long time, I guess.

However, I went out into the cemetery to try and find the graves of the 33 sets of brothers. Thank God, there were no Sullivan brothers, but 33 sets of brothers in the cemetery. I only found one set.

I'm going back with some of my grown children some day with a map to find all 33, and the colonel father and lieutenant son who both died in the European campaign and are buried in the Colleville cemetery. But I did find the principal graves that I was looking for, those of the sons of a President whose fascinating face was the last to be put up on Mount Rushmore, Teddy Roosevelt. He was elected at age 45, the second youngest man ever elected, but sworn in the first time because of McKinley's assassination when he was a year younger than Kennedy, 3 years younger than Clinton.

Teddy Roosevelt came to the White House in his forties with quite a family: a grown daughter from his first marriage who lived a long life here in Washington, DC, always outspoken, who died in 1980. I actually had a chance to shake her hand at a function when I came here as a freshman Congressman in 1977. Also there were one of his four sons and his daughter from his second wife. His first wife died virtually during their honeymoon period. His second daughter lived a good long life, she died in 1977, 3 years before her older half sister, and one of his sons, Archie, who holds two Silver Crosses from combat in New Guinea, in World War II. He lived to the ripe old age of 86. Alice Roosevelt lived until 96, and Ethel lived until 86, and Archie to 85 and a half.

□ 1600

But the two Roosevelt brothers whose graves I visited at Colleville are a fascinating story that should be taught in the schools of our Nation all during the last 11 months of commemorating the war in Europe. And we have got a bloody battle ahead of us, the 50th anniversary of the Battle of the Bulge, the Battle of Bastogne where German SS troops executed 109 Americans, where 10 or more miraculously played dead and crawled off into the woods, most of them wounded, to give testimony so that we could hang by the neck the SS officers that we caught. Most of them escaped. There will be plenty of ceremonies in the cold month in December, and I hope to be there whether or not I survive the November 8 election.

But I said on this House floor what Teddy Roosevelt said. He had been out of the White House then, in 1918, for 10 years, still a young man, 59, 2 years younger than I am. He died within a year. The death of this son broke his heart, his youngest son, the brother of the sixth, Quentin, who died at age 20. And I learned at his grave the day of his death was remarkable. He died on Bastille Day, the most famous day in French history, July 14, the day that the three lonely prisoners in the Bastille were released beginning the French Revolution, which unfortunately turned into the French reign of terror and the atheist slaughter of clergymen and women, and killed more priests than they did cut off the heads of royalty. But Quentin Roosevelt died in his fighter plane, in the sister squadron to the 94th aerosquadron which we discussed today during a commemorative for the incredible writer, adventurer and son of Iowa, James Norman Hall, the co-writer of Mutiny on the Bounty and Pitcairn Island, who flew with Rickenbacker in the 95th, and this is the sister squadron of the 94th. Twenty-four-old Quentin Roosevelt, youngest son of the former President, dies on Bastille Day, 1918, 20 years of age, shot down in aerial combat. When six-star General of the Army, John Joseph "Blackjack" Pershing, my father's supercommander, found out about it, he himself got in contact with Roosevelt and told him that his son, Quentin, had given his life for his country and for the liberation of northern France. Roosevelt, according to three-star general, great historian, and scholar Vernon Dick Walters, former Ambassador to Germany under President Reagan, looked down when he heard of Quentin's death and said, "When you've raised your sons to be eagles, you cannot expect them to act like doves."

He had four other sons. Let us see how his other sons did in the service of their country.

The oldest son, Teddy, who served in World War I, received the Medal of Honor for his actions on Utah Beach on D-day and died of a heart attack in the chow line with his men, still in the Battle of Normandy raging 36 days after D-day. Here is Theodore Roosevelt, Jr., 10 years older than Quentin, who died 26 years before. The oldest brother died on July 12, 2 days short of his kid brother, 26 years later, trying to liberate the very same country. It is

just a half a day's drive to the trenches where Quentin died is the area in Normandy where Teddy Roosevelt died. Here is part of Teddy Roosevelt's Medal of Honor award.

Brigadier General Roosevelt asked twice verbally, that he be allowed to accompany the leading assault craft in the Normandy invasion. It was denied. Then Brigadier General Roosevelt's written request for the mission was approved. He landed with the first wave of forces assaulting the enemy-held beaches. He repeatedly led groups off the beach, over the sea wall, and established them inland. His valor, courage, and presence in the very front of the attack, and his complete unconcern at being under heavy fire, 56 years of age, Madam Speaker, inspired his troops to the height of enthusiasm and self-sacrifice. Although the enemy had the beach under constant direct fire, Brigadier General Roosevelt moved from locality to locality, rallying the men around him.

It is not here, but he is the one who said with his officers and his staff, "Let the war begin here," meaning the war for the liberation of Europe from Nazi tyranny. He personally led them against the enemy. Under his seasoned, precise, calm, and unfaltering leadership the assault troops reduced the beach strong points and rapidly moved inland with minimum casualties. Brigadier General Theodore Roosevelt, Jr. contributed substantially to the successful establishment of the beachhead in France.

"When you raise your sons to be eagles, you cannot expect them to act like doves."

Next brother, Kermit, born 2 years and 1 month after Teddy, Jr. The three were born at Oyster Bay. The two youngest by his second wife, the two youngest were born here in Washington, DC. That is where Quentin was born. Kermit died on active duty in the combat area of Alaska, the forgotten war, June 4, 1943, a year and 2 days before his older brother received the Medal of Honor. Kermit, the second of the Roosevelt four sons to die, dies in uniform in a combat theater in Alaska. I do not know the circumstances.

The next one was Ethel. I told you she lived to be 86 and died in Oyster Bay where she was born.

Next son, No. 3 of the boys, Archibald Bullock Roosevelt, born April 9, Bataan Day, 1894, and served in World War I. He was 24 years of age when his 20-year-old brother died in his aircraft, shot down over the French trenches. And here is what Archie did. Terribly wounded in World War I, his arm and leg shattered. He nevertheless, in World War II, begged to be put back on active duty. His war wounds were so severe after World War I that they did not heal enough to get back on active duty in World War II until 10 years after World War I, the late 1920's. He goes back into combat in World War II and wins the Silver Star. As far as this Member of Congress is concerned, a Silver Star is a Distinguished Service Cross or a Medal of Honor without enough people witnessing it or without generally dying to get it. He wins a Silver Star, and then stays in combat in New Guinea, gets wounded, severely again, and wins a second star. Archie was quite a person around the town of his birth, Washington, DC, where he, I repeat, died at 85½, a great fighter against communism when it was not popular. And he died October 23, 1979 in Hobe Sound, FL, a real credit to the legend.

So there are four sons, all of them raised to be eagles, Medal of Honor, Silver Stars, two of them, three of them dying in combat areas, one of them shot down, the other dying with his men, D-day plus 36.

What a family. And today we read about people stealing bathrobes and towels off the U.S.S. *George Washington*.

A little fact sheet was handed to me the first day we arrived in Europe for the memorials for 50 years ago, and I think young people in America should understand that World War II was not this romantic, lovely war where everybody charged off to be part of it, to fight Hitler and Tojo and Mussolini. Only 38.8 percent of the people in World War II volunteered, 38.8, less than 39 percent.

What I used to tell the young kids in Vietnam when I went over there eight times as a correspondent, my heart going out to them because of the demonstrations in the streets and in London, I used to tell them, "You are all volunteers. You let yourself be drafted, didn't you? You volunteered. You held your head up. You are honorable. Couldn't you just have said you were a homosexual and beat it? Couldn't you have had some teeth pulled out, the way some people did, or couldn't you have shot yourself in the foot? Couldn't you have gone to Canada to hide out, or gone to Sweden?"

Come on. I remember being with Marines around the fire in DaNang that had just come back from combat in a small village. This is May 1966. And I said, "You're all volunteers." And they said, "We're Marines. Anyway, we are all volunteers here."

□ 1610

Later on we drafted Marines. A lot of Marines did not like that. When you tell the Army guys you are all volunteers, one of them, I remember one day, looked up and said, you know, "This reporter is right. We are volunteers. We don't have to be here." And they fought just as honorably to keep the soil of South Vietnam free as did the young men just a year or two older than I am fought to keep the soil of Korea free, as did my colleague, CHARLIE RANGEL, who is trying to free his country of the curse of narcotics with all the vigor that he fought as an infantryman in Korea.

I would walk up to people. I would tell this to my fellow colleagues with me, most of them World War II veterans, and they agreed. But I said to a couple of younger guys who were very promilitary, but did not serve, "Explain to me, if you will, why Vietnam is different from South Korea or from France that the Roosevelt boys both died 26 years apart trying to liberate." The French would not let us overfly France when we were trying to stop the terrorism of blowing up and murdering people including a U.S. lieutenant colonel in the streets of Paris, the Israeli Ambassador to Paris being shot down in the street like dogs, the LaBelle disco blown up April 5, 1986 in West Germany killing a Turkish girl, two U.S. Army sergeants, and the only magazine that put them on the cover was People magazine. Nobody remembered the second man killed, Jimmy Goins, because he died 2 months and 2 days later in a German-United States hospital with both legs cut off and died because of the water in his lungs, with his Philippine-American wife and his son at his bedside.

To stop that terror, Ronald Reagan launched our F-111's out of Upper Heyford in England, one of our bases that has been there since the Second World War until the last few months when it shut down. The French would not let us overfly their territory, so the French do not always come through as perfect allies.

But we think it is noble to stand there and praise the World War II generation while still keeping this cloud over the noble cause of trying to keep South Vietnam from its killing fields and people executed for knowing us or working with us, or 600,000 people drowned, raped, and torn apart by sharks in the South China Seas. People still try to say, as Clinton said to Peter Jennings' face during the D-day celebrations in one of his interviews, "Vietnam was wrong." It was not any more wrong than being in France.

The young veterans of that war, who are not so young now, will never have their dignity and honor restored until people begin to understand what President Reagan meant when he said, "Vietnam was a noble cause," fought improperly and screwed up by politicians in this city, its people just as worthy of freedom as the southern half of the Korean Peninsula where we are ginning up to what it looks like is another bloodletting to stop the tyranny of Kim Il-song.

Listen to these facts on World War II, and some of them I was not aware of: Of the almost 18 million men examined for induction, 35.8 percent were rejected; 6,420,000 young American males were rejected as physically or mentally

unfit. I will give you the exact figure: 17,955,000, almost 18 million, and we rejected almost 6½ million, and there were plenty of draftdodgers in World War II. I could name five actors just like that who dodged the draft while Tyrone Power and Clark Gable and Jimmy Stewart went off and took 4 years out of their careers, or David Niven, an English citizen, who went over and took 6 years out of his Sam Goldwyn contract to fight as a British officer in his forces, and I know all the guys that stepped up and took their parts, because my uncle was Jack Haley, the Tin Man in "The Wizard of Oz."

I was living in Beverly Hills, and we all talked around the table about who was overseas, like Glenn Ford, where the movie director John Ford, who did, and they were overseas, and they were expendable, overseas making films for the Navy. George Stevens was going across Europe in combat danger, making a color film for the U.S. Army and the U.S. Air Force. Clark Gable flying combat missions.

We still get all gaga that Edward R. Murrow went on one combat mission on a British Lancaster bomber. Yes, he took his life in his hands. That is pretty good. I did that 14 times.

How about guys like Clark Gable who were going on mission after mission or Jimmy Stewart, who flew a full combat career as a young colonel with 35 missions in B–24 Liberators. No, there were plenty of draftdodgers in World War II.

The average duration of service was 33 months; 73 percent went overseas. That means that more than one out of four never went overseas. Some of them were in combat in the Caribbean against German U-boats. No, that is considered overseas, if you went to Trinidad and flew out of Trinidad. That is statewide service for more than one out of four. Average months overseas: 16.2. Marines in Vietnam: 13 months. Army: 12 months. Combat survivability: 8.6 were killed in action out of 1,000. That is if you went into combat. Pretty good for U.S. forces. We treasured our men, unlike the Soviets where they probably had 50-percent casualties, because they just squandered their lives en masse. We talk about Japanese banzai charges, mass human-wave death against our machineguns. The Russians were even worse than the Japanese in squandering life to achieve victory.

Three died from other causes, accidents, being overseas in dangerous areas; 17.7 received nonmortal combat wounds.

To you young Americans, listen to what they got paid to drive Hitler to suicide: BOB MICHEL got 71 dollars and change, 71 dollars and 33 pennies. That is what he got as an enlisted man for fighting his way across Europe. Officers: Did anybody see that PBS special, "A Fighter Pilot's Story" the other night? More than two-thirds of his squadron were killed, some of them right in front of his face. One guy with his canopy shot up so he could not bail out. He turns right to that young, not so young now, fighter pilot, telling the story, looks over at the Thunderbolt wing to wing, and his young friend looks up at him and salutes, pow, right into the trees microseconds later. What did he get paid for doing that? He was paid $203.50. That is average pay. A second lieutenant would make a lot less than that flying Thunderbolts across Europe. No glory up in the clouds trying to shoot down Germans, in the weeds, day after day, until suddenly you look out, and suddenly you do not want to make any new friends. Quite a 2-hour documentary on PBS.

When you look at what it cost in the treasure of our hard-working people back here, nobody except Germany comes even close, to build gas chambers and kill and start a war that kills 55 million people, and while the Japanese started it, they weighed in, the Italians in Ethiopia, but it cost Germany $212 billion, and it cost them 10 million lives, 3½ million men in their army.

What would Germany be like today if they had not squandered the youth of their nation in two wars a quarter of a century apart?

But the United States spent almost $300 billion. In today's dollars this would be trillions, trillions. The U.S.S.R. spent $93 compared to our $288 billion, and we were sending tons of lend-lease to them; France only half of Germany.

By the way, France, 52 years ago today, 54 years ago today, June 17, sued for surrender. Hitler thought it was terrible that they did that. But he did not tell them that over the BBC. He knew why they had surrendered. Germans were in Paris 2 days ago, 54 years ago. They surrendered because when you drive around Normandy and look at the war memorials and these beautiful little Normandy towns, you say, "Is that from the battle for Normandy in World War II?" And then you look and you see a different style, a more ornate angel or figure of Christ on the statue, and then you realize that the World War II numbers are 4, 5, 10, 12 at the most. The names by the dozens on these statues are from World War I.

In the British first Battle of the Somme, the casualties in the first day were 57,000, 30,000 killed in action. That is three times the Battle of Antietam up here in Maryland. The slaughter in World War I was so massive you wonder how could they replay this in Europe a quarter of a century later. A quarter of a century? The war ended November 1918, and if you take away Ethiopia in the middle 1930's, and Japan in 1935 attacking China, if you use the bombing of Warsaw September 1, 1939, 21 years, short 2 months of 21 years, they are starting this killing all over again.

So a second Roosevelt brother joins his kid brother, Quentin, who died at 20, and we had 33 sets of brothers and a father and son, a father who fought in World War I as a lieutenant, dies with his son on different battlefields, I believe, in World War II.

Incredible, when you read the statistics of this great crusade.

I had a Member from Mississippi, and I do not think he did it meanly, he referred to me as a peacetime fighter pilot the other day on the floor talking about D-day, and went over, and I said, "GENE, where did you get that expression? Did you read my bio? It is in my bio." He said, "No, I heard you say it on the floor once." I explained to him why I have to say peacetime fighter pilot. Because that is a category that I am proud of.

Tony Coelho, who left this place in disgrace, thought by saying I was a fighter pilot it meant I was claiming I fought.

□ 1620

But, no, no, it meant like bomber pilot, cargo pilot, it meant fighter pilot. So now I have to put in my bio, because idiots do not know anything about the military, that I was a peacetime fighter pilot. But then I reminded my young friend from Mississippi that being a peacetime fighter pilot was pretty good in the 1950's because the Commander in Chief was worthy of the title. His name was Dwight David Eisenhower. He had worn 5 stars on his shoulder. He had run, as a 2-star, the invasion of Operation Torch in North Africa, the invasion of Sicily in 1943, he planned the invasions into Italy and was given this incredible responsibility in his 50's. He was born in 1889.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

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

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

Mr. GINGRICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WALKER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RICHARDSON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EMERSON, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

Mr. EMERSON, immediately following Mr. GINGRICH, at the end of his special order today.

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

Mr. HOBSON.
Ms. SNOWE.
Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. HYDE.
Mr. KING.
Mr. SOLOMON.
Mr. KLUG.
Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
Mr. FAWELL.

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

Mr. CARR.
Mr. KILDEE in two instances.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. SKELTON in two instances.
Mr. FORD of Michigan.
Mr. HOYER.
Mr. COYNE.
Mr. UNDERWOOD.
Mr. TORRICELLI in two instances.
Mr. BRYANT.
Mr. MENENDEZ.
Mr. EDWARDS of California.

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

Mr. DIXON.
Mr. SCHUMER.
Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut in two instances.
Mr. CARDIN.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 22 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, June 21, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3390. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, transmitting a notice of final regulations—Rehabilitation Long-Term Training pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

3391. A letter from the Federal Co-Chairman, Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1993, through March 31, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3392. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1993, through March 31, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 5(b) (96 Stat. 750, 102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3393. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation for the period October 1, 1993, through March 31, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3394. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period October 1, 1993, through March 31, 1994, pursuant to Public Law 95–452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

3395. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3396. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Compliance, Department of the Interior, transmitting notification of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

3397. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the exchange of lands within Gates of the Arctic National Park and Preserve, and for other purposes; to the Committee on National Resources.

3398. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting a comprehensive report on the Clean Coal Technology Program entitled, "Four Rivers Energy Modernization Project," pursuant to the Public Law 102–254; jointly, to the Committees on Appropriations, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GIBBONS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3937. A bill entitled: "The Export Administration Act of 1994"; with amendments (Rept. 103–531, Pt. 3). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3937. A bill entitled: "The Export Administration Act of 1994"; with amendments (Rept. 103–531, Pt. 4). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DELLUMS: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 2238. A bill to amend laws relating to Federal procurement, to authorize functions and activities under the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 103–545, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. OBEY: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4568. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1994, and for other purposes (Rept. 103–550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YATES: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 4602. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes (Rept. 103–551). Referred to the Committee of the While House on the State of the Union.

SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of Rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The Committees on the Judiciary and Public Works and Transportation discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3937; H.R. 3937 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAY:

H.R. 4595. A bill to designate the building located at 4021 Laclede in St. Louis, MO, for the period of time during which it houses operations of the U.S. Postal Service, as the "Marian Oldham Post Office"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 4596. A bill to designate the building located at 2200 North Highway 67 in Florissant, MO, for the period of time during which it houses operations of the U.S. Postal Service, as the "John L. Lawler, Jr. Post Office"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. BALLENGER, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. CANADY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. PORTER, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 4597. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. FOWLER (for herself, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. PICKETT):

H.R. 4598. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to make technical corrections to maps relating to the Coastal Barrier Resources System; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4599. A bill to authorize the lease of certain property transferred to the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; jointly,

to the Committees on Natural Resources and the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SPRATT:

H.R. 4600. A bill to amend the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to provide for the expedited consideration of certain proposed rescissions of budget authority; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations and Rules.

By Mr. YATES:

H.R. 4602. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself and Mr. STUMP):

H.J. Res. 378. Joint resolution commemorating June 22, 1994, as the 50th anniversary of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ACKERMAN (for himself, Mr. KING, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEVY, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. TORRES, Mr. PAXON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FISH, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. LOWEY, and Mr. SCHUMER):

H.J. Res. 379. Joint resolution to provide for a settlement of the railroad labor-management disputes between the Long Island Rail Road Co. and certain of its employees represented by the United Transportation Union; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.J. Res. 380. Joint resolution to designate the year 1995 as "Jazz Centennial Year"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (for himself, Mr. FILNER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BACCHUS of Florida, Mr. BAESLER, Mr. BARCA of Wisconsin, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BARLOW, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. BROOKS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. BYRNE, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. CARR, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. COLEMAN, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COPPERSMITH, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. EWING, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. FROST, Ms. FURSE, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HOYER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KASICH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KING, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEVY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LONG, Ms. LOWEY, Mrs. MALONEY, Mr. MANN, Ms. MARGOLIES-MEZVINSKY, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCHALE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MINETA, Mr. MINGE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PARKER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. PAXON, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REED, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROMERÓ-BARCELO, Mr. ROSE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SAWYER, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SHEPHERD, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SLATTERY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. STARK, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. STUMP, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SWETT, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. THORNTON, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. VENTO, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WATT, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. WISE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WYNN, Mr. YATES, and Mr. ZIMMER):

H. Res. 457. Resolution expressing the Sense of the House of Representatives that June 21, 1994, be designated as "Freedom Summer Remembrance Day" and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. BROOKS introduced a bill (H.R. 4601) to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Cygne Sauvage;* 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. 84: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 1080: Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 1737: Mr. WISE and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 2019: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 2488: Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 2731: Mr. DREIER.

H.R. 2826: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. FARR.

H.R. 3173: Mr. PAXON.

H.R. 3179: Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 3293: Mr. MOORHEAD and Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 3636: Mr. YATES and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 3762: Ms. MOLINARI.

H.R. 3862: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Ms. DUNN, Mr. COX, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. FIELDS of Texas.

H.R. 3875: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. MICHEL, and Mr. PENNY.

H.R. 3897: Mr. EHLERS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 3939: Mr. BROWN of Ohio and Mr. DARDEN.

H.R. 3949: Mr. FROST, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PAXON, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, Mr. COX, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. THOMPSON, and Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas.

H.R. 4057: Mr. CRANE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. TANNER, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. PAXON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. KLUG, Mr. FROST, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. DREIER, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 4074: Mr. NADLER, Mr. HAMILTON, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. TALENT, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 4081: Mr. APPLEGATE.

H.R. 4115: Mr. TOWNS and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 4142: Mr. SHAYS, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mrs. MALONEY and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 4148: Mr. TORKILDSEN, Ms. SCHENK and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 4195: Mr. OWENS and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 4198: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 4350: Mr. BALLENGER.

H.R. 4370: Mr. MCDERMOTT and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 4371: Mr. SHAW and Mr. TORKILDSEN.

H.R. 4386: Mr. SHAW, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. FINGERHUT, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. FARR, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CARR, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. COLEMAN, Mr.

DEAL, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BARLOW, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 4399: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 4404: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 4468: Ms. DANNER, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. MURPHY.

H.R. 4497: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 4498: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. STOKES, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. STARK, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. THOMPSON, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 4514: Mr. TORRES.

H.J. Res. 171: Mr. SPENCE.

H.J. Res. 332: Mr. FINGERHUT and Mr. SCHAEFER.

H.J. Res. 343: Mr. LAFALCE and Mr. BACCHUS of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 3: Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. GOODLATTE.

H. Con. Res. 202: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Con. Res. 239: Mr. PALLONE and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H. Res. 247: Mr. CALVERT.

DISCHARGE PETITIONS—ADDITIONS OR DELETIONS

The following Members added their names to the following discharge petitions:

Petition 11 by Mr. RAMSTAD on House Resolution 247: Scott L. Klug, Ken Calvert, Dean A. Gallo, and Floyd Spence.

Petition 12 by Mr. TRAFICANT on H.R. 3261: Dan Glickman, Thomas J. Ridge, Scott McInnis, and Peter Koekstra.

Petition 15 by Mr. BILIRAKIS on House Resolution 382: Philip M. Crane, Floyd Spence, and Craig Thomas.

Petition 16 by Mr. ZELIFF on House Resolution 407: Sam Coppersmith, David Minge, David Mann, Collin C. Peterson, Jane Harman, Charles W. Stenholm, Eric Fingerhut, Nathan Deal, Don Johnson, Jay Inslee, Marjorie Margolies-Mezvinsky, Tim Holden, Glen Browder, Peter A. DeFazio, Lynn Schenk, Karen L. Thurman, Dave McCurdy, James H. Bilbray, Maria Cantwell, William F. Clinger, Jr., Martin T. Meehan, Sherrod Brown, Bud Shuster, Pete Geren, and Tim Roemer.

Petition 17 by Mr. SHAW on House Resolution 386: Gary A. Franks.

Petition 18 by Mr. HASTERT on House Resolution 402: Jim Kolbe, Michael Bilirakis, Dana Rohrabacher, Fred Upton, Harris W. Fawell, Amo Houghton, Peter Blute, Sonny Callahan, Terry Everett, Ralph M. Hall, Floyd Spence, James A Hayes, James A. Barcia, W.J. (Billy) Tauzin, John J. Duncan, Jr., and Michael Huffington.

Petition 19 by Mr. EWING on House Resolution 415: Jim Nussle, Jennifer Dunn, William M. Thomas, Barbara F. Vucanovich, Scott McInnis, Wayne Allard, Henry J. Hyde, Stephen Horn, Wally Herger, Michael Bilirakis, Philip M. Crane, Paul E. Gillmor, Dana Rohrabacher, David L. Hobson, Michael D. Crapo, Christopher Shays, Deborah Pryce, Jim Kolbe, James M. Inhofe, Craig Thomas, J. Dennis Hastert, and Randy "Duke" Cunningham.

Petition 21 by Mr. HANSEN on House Resolution 405: Bill Paxon, Martin R. Hoke, Robert E. (Bud) Cramer, Jr., James A. Traficant, Jr., Ronald K. Machtley, Tom Lewis, Jack Kingston, Tim Valentine, John L. Mica, John L. Duncan, Jr., Gary A. Franks, Rick Lazio, William F. Goodling, L.F. Payne, Bill Archer, Karen L. Thurman, Earl Hutto, Ralph M. Hall, Christopher H. Smith, and Edward R. Royce.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE STATE DEPARTMENT CONSIDERS ISSUING A VISA TO A VIOLENT ISLAMIC FUNDAMENTALIST; HASN'T STATE LEARNED ITS LESSON FROM THE TRADE CENTER BOMBING?

HON. OLYMPIA J. SNOWE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD the following article from the May 13, 1994, edition of New York's Forward newspaper. This article discusses in disturbing detail the State Department's current consideration of a visa request by Sheikh Rashid el-Ghanoushi, the convicted leader of Tunisia's violent Islamic fundamentalist movement.

As ranking Republican of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on International Operations, last year I led an investigation into the legislative weaknesses and incredible bureaucratic bungling that led to the State Department repeatedly issuing American visas to the radical Egyptian cleric, Sheikh Omar Abdel Rahman, who had at that time already been implicated in the assassination of President Anwar Sadat. Now, 15 months after the bombing of the World Trade Center by followers of Sheikh Abdel Rahman—and just before the Sheikh himself is set to go on trial for his part in the bombing—the State Department is apparently considering making the same mistake by granting a visa to his Tunisian equivalent, Sheikh Ghanoushi.

Tunisia is a pro-Western moderate country surrounded and threatened on one side by the radical regime in Libya and on the other by a strong Iranian-style fundamentalist movement in Algeria, which Ghanoushi is trying to export to Tunisia. And yet, it seems that the State Department is currently involved in anguished hand-wringing over the visa application, out of concern that there must be a presumption of a right to come to the United States unless it can prove that Sheikh Ghanoushi was at some point personally involved in a terrorist act.

It apparently is not enough that Ghanoushi fled Tunisia after his underground organization launched violent attacks against the Government of Tunisia. It apparently is not enough that he has been convicted in absentia to life imprisonment in Tunisia for his personal involvement in planning his group's attempts to overthrow the Government and assassinate Tunisia's President Ben Ali. It apparently is not enough that he has denounced the United States for its support for Israel, and has stated, "The Jewish Satans have been at work * * * to promote the current hellish marriage between the American-led Western project and the Jewish project to jointly destroy the Islamic world and control its riches."

Mr. Speaker, after my investigation into the Sheikh Abdel Rahman case, I introduced H.R. 2041, the Terrorist Interdiction Act. This legislation was a package of reforms in the State Department's visa and consular operations to stop the Department from repeating its mistakes in issuing a visa to Sheikh Abdel Rahman. All but one of the reforms contained in that bill were enacted as a part of the fiscal year 1994–95 State Department Authorization Act. Unfortunately, the one part that was not enacted into law is that section of H.R. 2041 that would automatically deny visas to members of terrorist groups. This was not enacted because it is under the jurisdiction of the Judiciary Committee, which has not yet reported out any legislation this Congress relating to immigration reform, visa procedures, or criminal aliens.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the State Department will use its existing discretionary authority to deny entry to Sheikh Ghanoushi. I also hope that my colleagues take note of this case, and understand that passage of my legislation is needed now, more than ever.

[From the New York Forward, May 13, 1994]

TUNISIAN TERROR SHEIK SPARKS FUROR ON HILL—"WOULD-BE AYATOLLAH" SEEKS ENTRY TO UNITED STATES

(By Lucette Lagnado)

NEW YORK.—A militantly anti-West, anti-Israel sheik—dubbed "the would-be Ayatollah of Tunisia"—is attempting to gain entry into America over the objections of key American senators and the Tunisian government, which is warning that granting him a visa would be tantamount to a "hostile act."

For the past several weeks, a visa application for Sheik Rashid el-Ghanoushi, the exiled leader of Tunisia's Islamic fundamentalist movement, has been pending inside the State Department, even as a battle rages both at Foggy Bottom and in Congress over whether to keep him out of this country. Key staffers of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee have expressed unease over his possible arrival, while a ranking Republican, Senator Brown, has urged the State Department to exercise extreme caution in its decision-making.

"HELLISH MARRIAGE"

The possible arrival of the sheik is forcing a re-examination of American visa policies, including how generous the State Department should be in granting entry papers to controversial individuals who, though not formally branded as "terrorists," are known for espousing extremist views. The debate comes as Sheik Ghanoushi's notorious counterpart, the Egyptian cleric, Omar Abdel Rahmad, is scheduled to go on trial in New York for his alleged connection to a plot to blow up key New York landmarks, including the Lincoln and Holland tunnels and the United Nations. The fight over Sheik Ghanoushi—who has referred to Israel as a "cancer," condemned Jews as "Satanic" and denounced the so-called "hellish marriage", between America and Jews that seek "to jointly destroy the Islamic world"—was precipitated several weeks ago when the University of Southern Florida invited him to participate in a conference, scheduled for mid-May. Although the conference has been postponed, the invitation remains in effect, and the State Department must decide what to do about the sheik.

"The information we were given raises very serious questions about whether Sheik Ghanoushi should be admitted into the U.S.," a top aide to Senator Brown told the Forward. "The Tunisians are gravely concerned about what they describe as Sheik Ghanoushi's terrorist involvement as well as a spillover of fundamentalist instability," he added.

Senator Brown has sent a letter to Secretary of State Christopher, asking him to evaluate reports that the sheik has sponsored and supported "violent action against Americans, against American allies, and wholesale disruption of the Middle East peace process." Senator D'Amato, a New York Republican, has also raised objections about the sheik, as have staffers for Senator Helms of North Carolina.

LONDON EXILE

Although Sheik Ghanoushi was sentenced in absentia to life imprisonment in 1989 for attempting to overthrow the Tunisian government—and accused of plotting to kill its president—some Democrats on the committee believe that the Tunisian government is overreacting. They note that the sheik was granted asylum by Britain, a country, they say, that would be loath to welcome a terrorist in its midst.

"There are values we strongly stand for as Americans, and one of them is freedom of speech," said another Foreign Relations Committee staffer. Before we make a decision we want proof [of terrorist involvement] and saying ugly stuff is not sufficient."

A State Department official told the Forward the agency "received an application [from the sheik] and the matter is under consideration." He refused to elaborate.

Even from his London exile, Sheik Ghanoushi has been openly calling for the overthrow of the Tunisian regime of President Ben Ali, and the calls have grown more strident since elections in March. After Mr. Ben Ali—the only candidate for president—received 99.91 percent of the vote, the sheik signed a communique urging Tunisians "to unite to rid the country of this specter of dictatorship." according to a wire-service report.

Despite its obvious failings, Tunisia, according to Daniel Pipes, editor of the Middle East Quarterly, "is among the better of the autocracies." Mr. Pipes says the Tunisian government is terrified because of the growing fundamentalist fervor in neighboring Algeria. The Tunisians—who have relatively progressive policies toward women and Jews—believe that, if given a chance, Sheik Ghanoushi would swiftly radicalize the country.

"JEWISH SATANS"

According to Mr. Pipes and other sources, the sheik has been spotted at a number of key Islamic conferences in Iran and the Sudan that were also attended by other radical clerics. Mr. Pipes likened these conferences to a sort of "Islamic

Internacionale," where the leaders are united in their staunch hatred of America, the West and Israel. "Yes, they speak different languages and eat different foods—but that's not what counts. What counts is ideology," Mr. Pipes said.

In Tampa, Todd Simmons, spokesman for the University of South Florida, confirmed that the sheik had been invited to be part of a "roundable" discussion among scholars. "I know nothing about the man or his politics," Mr. Simmons said, insisting that the invitation did not mean the college "is endorsing or sanctioning any of his beliefs."

Sheik Ghanoushi is said to be considerably more worldly—and more slick—than his Islamic counterparts. He dresses in Western-style suits and can be spotted giving interviews to journalists in fashionable London tearooms.

Statements attributed to the sheik and provided to the Forward by Senator Brown's office suggest that his views smack of a peculiar branch of anti-Semitism that combines classic European anti-Jewish canards, blended with a distinctly Arabist tinge. "The Jewish Satans have been at work since the . . . Renaissance and the Reformation in Europe to promote the current hellish marriage between the American-led Western project and the Jewish project to jointly destroy the Islamic world and control its riches" is but one example among many now under State Department scrutiny.

CONGRESSMAN KILDEE HONORS ALFRED FEDERICO

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I rise before you today to urge my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to a pioneer who has dedicated his life to the working individual, Mr. Alfred Federico. Al's remarkable lifetime of achievements will be recognized by the Unity for Justice at a dinner in Flint, MI, on June 18, 1994.

Alfred Federico began his long and distinguished career at Buick as a young man in the year 1927, working periodically until in 1934 the seniority of an employee was recorded. In 1936, he became involved in union activities, spurred on through his close association with Roy and Victor Reuther.

When the United Automobile Workers Local 599 was chartered in 1937, he was the first chief steward in plant No. 31, department 17. His union career included being committeeman, shop committeeman, and a member of the political action and education committees. Al's reputation as a fair and effective leader was recognized by his fellow union members when they elected him chairman of the UAW National Negotiating Committee. It was during his service on this committee where he and Walter Reuther established a long and close friendship. To this day, Al keeps alive those ideas that Walter Reuther helped develop to enrich not only the UAW but all society. Indeed, it is because of people like Al that these ideas are now ingrained in our society.

Brother Federico's exemplary personal history as a union man continues as he devotes his life to helping those who seek his assistance. Since his retirement in 1971, Al has continued to represent his union brothers and sisters by working to resolve consumers problems in conjunction with the consumer protection division of the Genesee County Prosecutors office. He has voluntarily given of his time and expertise in this work. To this day, Al remains active at Local 599, serving as a mentor and champion of worker's rights.

On January 15, 1994, Al was presented the Mayor's Drum Major Award for contributing to the Flint community in the area of labor, exhibiting the life and legacy of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, Al Federico has been a sure and steady mentor of mine whose ideas and advice have helped form my political philosophy. Without a doubt, the UAW and the city of Flint are better because of Al Federico. I know with certitude that I am a better person because of Al Federico. I am very pleased to have this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the 103d Congress and the Nation the outstanding achievements of this truly remarkable individual.

TRIBUTE TO DR. ETHEL B. STALLING

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to honor the memory of a fellow Missourian, Dr. Ethel B. Stalling, who passed away on June 8 at the age of 73. Dr. Stalling, a resident of Lake Lotawana, practiced as a chiropractor for over 50 years, contributing to her community through her many leadership positions and valued friendships.

Dr. Stalling was originally from Lafayette County, and our families have been friends for at least three generations. Upon graduating from Cleveland Chiropractic College of Kansas City in 1941, she began working in Mexico, MO, and then started her practice in Cass County in 1949. In 1992, she received the Cleveland Chiropractic College's Alumnus of the Year Award. She was also an influential member of the Missouri State Chiropractic Association, and was the recipient of a service award from that association as well. In 1989, she was named Chiropractor of the Year by the International Chiropractors Association.

Dr. Stalling held several leadership positions, including president of the Academy of Missouri Chiropractors, secretary and president of the alumni association of Cleveland Chiropractic College of Kansas City, and vice president of the Cleveland Chiropractic College multicampus board of trustees. She also was an officer of the Missouri State Chiropractors Association and a member of the Pleasant Hill Chamber of Commerce.

She was an excellent health care provider and her community benefitted from her service and warm spirit. Dr. Stalling will be deeply missed by all who knew her.

ANOTHER ENERGY SOURCE

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to inform my colleagues of the unique energy source Mount Hope Hydro, Inc., can provide to help avoid the rolling blackouts endured throughout the Northeast last winter. Mount Hope is developing an advanced pumped storage waterpower project located in northwestern New Jersey which will provide an alternative, reliable, and safe power supply across the Northeast.

Mr. Frank Fisher, president of Mount Hope, recently testified before the House Energy and Power Subcommittee and revealed the important contribution advanced pumped storage waterpower can make to our Nation's energy supply. I am providing a copy of Mr. Fisher's testimony for my colleagues to review.

TESTIMONY OF FRANK S. FISHER, PRESIDENT, MOUNT HOPE HYDRO, INC., BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND POWER, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, MARCH 17, 1994

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee: My name is Frank Fisher, and I am president of Mount Hope Hydro, Incorporated, which is developing a large, advanced pumped storage waterpower project in northwestern New Jersey, 35 miles due west of New York City. Thank you for the opportunity to testify this morning on measures which should be taken to avoid future electric service interruptions such as those which occurred on the Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland ("PJM") Interconnection this past January.

As other witnesses before the Subcommittee have testified, the rolling blackouts of January 19 revealed some shortcomings within the PJM system. It is difficult for me to be precise about the exact causes of the blackouts because we have not had access to all of the pertinent information. However, one factor was that massive demand for natural gas caused a deficiency in pipeline supply. Simply put, there was not enough to go around. Next, the system is dependent on technologies which are not weather resistent, and as a result, power plants could not operate to full capacity under the extreme cold. Also, PJM typically does not consider the winter months a period of peak demand, so a significant proportion of capacity was out of service for planned maintenance and repair work.

Clearly, the region—and the nation as a whole—needs a low-cost insurance policy against future blackouts and brownouts. Diversity of power sources is key to preventing peak demand power shortages in the future. The recurrent theme in recent press releases and comments about the crisis—that such events are so rare and unpredictable that it would not be cost-effective to guard against them—ignores the potential benefits of new technology.

Instead of taking recent events as a warning, power companies are likely to continue to be pushed by regulatory uncertainties and increasing commercial pressure to take a short-term view. Indeed, they risk being penalized for not doing so. Many PJM utilities are moving toward natural gas projects as the solution to future demand, despite the fact that the 1991 New Jersey Energy Master Plan, for one, warned about the danger of excessive reliance on a single resource. Depending on natural gas as the only new

source of reliable, clean power could set the region on a long-term course for economic disaster.

Alternatives are available to provide reliable, safe power on a nearly instantaneous basis. What's more, as Clean Air Act standards tighten in the highly-industrialized Northeast region, it is in everyone's interest to look for new power sources which do not create the local pollution emissions associated with gas burning utility plants.

For example, the Mount Hope Project currently under development will, when completed in 2002, operate at a capacity of 2000 megawatts * * * enough to protect more than half a million homes from blackouts or brownouts during peak demand periods. Had Mount Hope been on line in January, it would have provided the low-cost peaking power and transmission stability to prevent the blackouts, serving as PJM's "energy insurance policy."

Fundamentally, Mount Hope's pumped storage technology works on the simple principle of gravity. A 1.6 billion gallon aboveground reservoir will be connected by a shaft to an underground powerhouse and water storage caverns which serve as a lower reservoir. Water will circulate back and forth between the reservoirs in a "closed cycle," and during peak electrical demand periods or simply on demand, water will be released from the upper reservoir into the vertical shaft to the powerhouse, 2,800 feet underground.

Once in the powerhouse, the water will pass through six fast response turbines which can reach full generating capacity in less than 15 seconds. The power is brought to the surface by cables in another shaft, and is ultimately connected to existing transmission lines.

After traveling through the turbines, the water is stored in the underground lower reservoir. During off-peak hours, the turbines will be reversed to pump the water back to the upper reservoir, at which point the process can start again. This entire process can be repeated up to 20 times a day to meet demand and to optimize the use of other regional generating facilities. It is impervious to weather since underground temperatures remain at a constant 56 degrees Fahrenheit.

Mount Hope is patterned on the Dinorwig Pumped Storage project operated in Wales by the British National Grid Company. Dinorwig is one of the world's most technologically advanced pumped storage facilities and uses a fast-response technology which can produce at full output from standstill in less than a minute. This technology significantly enhances the capacity and reliability of the British transmission system, far beyond the capabilities of the earlier, less-sophisticated pumped storage facilities on the PJM grid. Indeed, the lack of advanced pumped storage facilities makes the U.S. unique among the industrialized nations.

Because of its location and ultra-fast response capabilities, Mount Hope also offers the benefits of increasing the capacity of the existing regional high-voltage transmission system. It will provide a competitive advantage in its ability to enhance the effective import capability of the transmission system. Mount Hope's ability to permit the PJM utilities to take advantage of remotely located power sources beyond their boundaries will provide significantly increased reliability. Potentially, billions of dollars could be saved through enhancing the ability of the PJM utilities to import less expensive energy from such sources.

As attractive as the Mount Hope Project sounds, we have found it difficult to make progress in our discussions with utilities in the PJM grid. These difficulties are threefold. First, because of the increasingly competitive nature of their marketplace, the utilities are increasingly compelled to focus on short-term requirements without proper regard for the long term. While natural gas may offer a short-term "fix" during the '90's, this situation is unlikely to last long into the next decade. A prudent long-term view must contemplate a mix of resources, and on such a view, a project like Mount Hope doubly merits consideration. Not only does it offer an alternative source of energy in itself, but it can enhance the efficiency of other sources of generation and improve both the capacity and the stability of the regional transmission system.

The second problem is that non-utility power project developers are often left in the dark to assess the benefits of new technology to potential utility customers. Most utilities hold data relating to their needs as proprietary information, so developers of alternative projects are left to estimate or assume the degree of their projects' potential benefits to the utilities. As a result, the true benefits of projects based on new technology, like Mount Hope, may never be fully measured.

While we at Mount Hope understand there may be justification for a degree of confidentiality surrounding utility data, the future energy needs of the Northeast are far too important to allow this to be an obstacle to progress. We must work cooperatively toward our common goal of providing a reliable, cost-effective source of electricity to the consumer and not let the window of opportunity offered by Mount Hope pass by the region. Under its FERC license, the Mount Hope Project must start construction by August 1996 and it is important that we secure commitments as soon as possible.

SOLOMON DERIDES SHAM LEADERSHIP DEAL WITH DEFICIT CHICKEN HAWKS ON A–Z

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, today the majority leader and a small group of Democrats unveiled what can only be described as a sham deal in return for keeping those Members from signing the A–Z spending cut discharge petition.

The concessions the deficit chicken hawks have wrung out of their leadership won't even provide a transparent fig leaf of political cover for avoiding real spending cuts.

We had already been assured that the remaining appropriations bills would be brought under an open amendment process so that is no real concession. And moderate Democrats had already been promised a vote by their leadership this session on various budget process and entitlement reforms in return for their support for the budget resolution earlier this year.

The only thing new in this is that those who are boasting about this great compromise breakthrough seem to believe they have actually won something new. The Democrat leadership has done a masterful job in recycling the same old bargaining chips for every new deal they are forced to cut with this group. It is a shrewd ploy as long as nobody calls their bluff and tries to cash in the chips on previous deals.

The bottom line remains that there is no substitute for voting on real spending cuts now as guaranteed by the A–Z plan. Hiding behind process reforms won't save the taxpayers a dime or reduce the deficit by a penny. It's simply a way of putting off until tomorrow what should have been done yesterday.

AVIATION PIONEER EMILY WARNER

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the Colorado State Senate in saluting Capt. Emily Warner, the first woman pilot for a modern U.S. airline. Captain Warner is one of Colorado's 20th century heroines.

EMILY WARNER HONORED BY COLORADO SENATE

(By Lance Ross)

The Colorado State Senate unanimously approved this week a resolution honoring Capt. Emily Warner, the first woman pilot for a modern U.S. airline. Warner was hired as a Frontier Airlines second officer in 1973, and is now with the Federal Aviation Administration.

The resolution is now pending in the Colorado House of Representatives.

"With 15 years of aviation-instructing experience and 7,000 hours, Emily Warner already had more flying experience than the vast majority of men being hired by the airlines," the resolution said of her struggle to break the barrier against women commercial pilots.

Warner was cited for "her remarkable achievements and contributions to state and national history."

"The most recent honor for her has come from the Friends of the Granby Airport, Inc., who have initiated the Emily Howell Warner Aviation Education Resource Center in Cooperation with the Granby Public Library," the resolution adds.

EAGLE SCOUT CHARLES WESLEY WELLS

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, last evening, Charles Wesley Wells received the highest award of the Boy Scouts of America when he was awarded the rank of Eagle at his Eagle Scout Award Ceremony in Burke, VA.

This exemplary young man is the son of Col. Peter Wells and Karen Wells. Though born in Germany while his father was on active duty with the United States Army there, he is an All-American kid who has grown up in Virginia and Texas where he learned persistence, dedication, and the value of hard work.

A weight-lifter, outdoorsman, fisherman, and automobile enthusiast, he is a senior at Lake

Braddock Secondary School and a member of Messiah United Methodist Church. His determination to succeed has kept him in pursuit of his goal of an Eagle badge for 7 years, as he achieved rank after rank in the Scout program.

Charlie, as we all know him, concluded his quest for the rank of Eagle with an outstanding Eagle project on ecology involving labeling storm drains in the Kings Park neighborhood of Fairfax County. After receiving approval for the project from the State of Virginia, the project required Charlie to work for 8 months before it was finally completed.

On behalf of myself and of the American people I offer today our congratulations and express our great admiration as the rank of Eagle is awarded to an outstanding young American, Charles Wells.

CONGRESSMAN KILDEE HONORS MR. JOHN (J.D.) DOTSON

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today before my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to pay tribute to an outstanding resident of my hometown of Flint, MI, Mr. J.D. Dotson.

J.D. Dotson was instrumental in the organizing of the United Automobile Workers [UAW] labor union in Flint, MI. He began work in the Buick foundry at the age of 21, coming to Flint from his birthplace of Vicksburg, MS, living in Chicago, Kankakee, IL, and finally Royal, NJ, along the way. He soon recognized a need for a union and began working with others toward that end.

As was the custom in those days, organizers were threatened with bodily harm. Mr. Dotson was no exception, receiving his share of threats. But he did not let that deter him from his goal. As the movement progressed, he was positioned as the captain of the Flying Squadron, a protest group. His courage and leadership skills were called on often anytime there was activity in one of the plants at Buick.

At this time Buick was a very segregated workplace. Blacks were only allowed to enter the plant at two locations and were only allowed to work in one place within the plant, the foundry. It was at this time that Mr. Dotson decided he needed to have a job in another part of the plant. He had worked closely with the legendary union leader, Walter Reuther, and decided to integrate the plant. In 1934 he was the first black to leave the foundry and began work in factory No. 31.

Now, at age 92, Mr. Dotson is still active in union affairs. He is a national board member and has traveled with the board to such places as Lansing, Columbus, OH, and Albion, MI. He continues to hold the positions of sergeant at arms, guide, and has a seat on the legislative committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an honor and a pleasure for me to rise today to pay tribute to this outstanding labor pioneer, J.D. Dotson. His courageous activities led to the formation of the UAW as well as the integration of the workplace and the union. His deeds and actions will never be forgotten by the millions of union members throughout this country. I wish him well as he is being honored at the Unity for Justice Dinner on Saturday, June 18, 1994. J.D. Dotson is truly an outstanding American.

TRIBUTE TO FATHER JOHN CONDIT

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to Father John Condit, an outstanding Missourian and former Navy chaplain who recently passed away at the age of 74. His professionalism and devotion to duty were admired by all who knew him.

After finishing his secondary education in Jefferson City, MO, and attending both the St. Louis Preparatory Seminary and Kenrick Seminary, Father Condit was ordained for the Archdiocese of St. Louis in 1953. He then served as the associate pastor of several parishes in the State.

Father John Condit was not only respected for his commitment to his parishioners, but also for his service to the U.S. armed services as a Navy chaplain. Father Condit received his commission in 1953 and served the Navy in this capacity for 20 years when he retired with the rank of captain. He dedicated the remainder of his years to serving as the pastor for the St. Francis Xavier Church in Taos, MO.

Father Condit also demonstrated his service to others through his involvement with veterans organizations, the Kiwanis Club and the American Legion. Father John Condit was deeply committed to his faith, his country and his parishioners. He will be missed not only by his many friends, but by the community he served for so many years.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE CITIES OF RIVEIRA AND NEWARK

HON. ROBERT G. TORRICELLI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. Speaker, I am both pleased and honored to rise before the House today in recognition of the very important partnership that has recently been agreed upon between the city of Riveira in the Autonomous Region of Galicia, and the city of Newark in my home State of New Jersey.

The June 17 signing of a sister city agreement between the mayors of Newark and Riveira is significant not only in its fostering of better international ties, but also in its recognition of the important contribution that Newark's 20,000 Galician and Spanish residents have made to the community at large. As most of these residents originally hail from Riveira, it is only fitting that a formal bond between the two cities be formed in appreciation of that vital link that they share.

The sister-city agreement between Riveira and Newark offers prospects that far exceed the symbolic level. From economic exchanges to athletic, educational and tourism endeavors, this partnership will broaden the horizons of each community and offer a special element of cultural enrichment that few cities can boast.

I congratulate Mayor Sharpe James of Newark and Mayor Jose Luis Torres-Colomer of Riveira on this landmark occasion, and I thank our Spanish and Galician neighbors for their continued contribution to our State.

Mr. Speaker, I call upon all of my colleagues to join me in saluting the cities of Newark and Riveira, and in wishing them the best of luck in what will no doubt be a long and rewarding relationship.

REMARKS REGARDING THE MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON THE RACIAL JUSTICE ACT

HON. CHARLES E. SCHUMER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, although some Members of the House sought to portray yesterday's vote on the motion to instruct the conferees not to include the Racial Justice Act in the final crime bill as up or down vote on the Racial Justice Act, many Members, myself included, viewed the motion as a vote on the retroactive application of the act. The version of the Racial Justice Act passed by the House and included in the House crime bill includes a retroactivity provision.

During the floor debate on the Racial Justice Act, I stated that I intended to work to strike retroactivity at conference. In keeping with that position, I supported the motion to instruct the conferees not to include the Racial Justice Act as passed by the House, not because I oppose the Racial Justice Act, but because the motion was really a vote on the retroactive application of the act. I support the Racial Justice Act and I intend to work at conference to create better, more tightly drawn, nonretroactive provision prohibiting the discriminatory application of the death penalty.

IN HONOR OF THE PARTICIPANTS OF THE 67TH ANNUAL NATIONAL SPELLING BEE

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a group of New Jersey students for their participation in the 67th annual National Spelling Bee which was held in Washington, DC, from May 29 to June 3, 1994.

Among the participants was Helen Isip, 13, of Jersey City, the daughter of Domingo and Maria L. Isip. Helen represented Hudson County and was sponsored by her local newspaper, the Jersey Journal. She was a student at St. Paul's School of Excellence and will attend Holy Family Academy in the fall. Helen was in the top quarter of the competing spellers and the second best speller in New Jersey.

I am proud to have such an outstanding student representing Hudson County in a national competition. Helen's work is exemplary and deserves to be recognized. She has earned first honors in all her academic subjects since the fourth grade. Her hard work and dedication have truly paid off. Her favorite subjects are history and math. Those who say, "Our youth are in decline," need look only at Helen for a shining example of what America has to offer the world.

Helen was among the 238 students nationwide who participated in the spelling bee. The National Spelling Bee was sponsored by Scripps Howard Newspapers and other newspapers from around the United States. Authorized sponsors organized local spelling bees and sent their champions to Washington, DC, for the national event.

I also want to commend the Jersey Journal for graciously sponsoring the local competition. The National Spelling Bee is an annual tradition, and has become an important showcase for our young academic achievers. Sponsoring a local event and sending a champion to national competition demonstrates the Journal's strong ties to Jersey City and the greater Hudson County community, and I want to thank them for their commitment.

The participants in the 67th annual Spelling Bee deserve our congratulations for their accomplishments. Their dedication and excellence bodes well before America as it prepares for the 21st century. I salute them today and wish them luck in the future endeavors.

TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN LEGION FOR THE UPPER PENINSULA SUMMER CONVENTION

HON. BOB CARR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to pay tribute to the American Legion and this year's host of the Upper Peninsula Summer Convention, Uren-Cooper Post 50 of Iron Mountain, MI.

This year we celebrate two historic anniversaries. Fifty years ago this month, soldiers from Michigan, and all across our country, landed on the beaches of Normandy to liberate Europe and save the world from the tyranny of Nazi Germany.

In that same year, Congress passed and President Roosevelt signed one of the most important pieces of Federal legislation ever written. What began as a grassroots effort by Legionnaires across the country ended with the passage of the GI bill. As a result, veterans were given the opportunity to get a quality education and find new and better jobs.

As we commemorate the anniversaries of these historic events, it seems fitting that we again recall the sacrifices made by our Nation's veterans. We must rededicate ourselves to faithfully living up to the commitments we as a country have made to them, whether the issue is COLA's, VA benefits, spousal support, homelessness, or helping veterans suffering from exposure to agent orange or the mysterious Persian Gulf illnesses.

Today, as the American Legion Upper Peninsula Association prepares for their summer convention, I ask my colleagues to join me in redoubling our efforts on behalf of these men and women who have given so many years of leadership and service to our Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REFORM ACT

HON. WILLIAM F. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining Representative FAWELL and 22 of our colleagues in reintroducing the Occupational Safety and Health Reform Act. The bill is for the most part identical to H.R. 2937, which Mr. FAWELL introduced last August. What I said about H.R. 2937 then applies as much to the bill we are introducing today:

> This legislation will force the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to reorient its compliance philosophy from one of confrontation—a philosophy which measures success by the number and amount of penalties levied and not by results—to one which will help employers comply with the law and one which will provide incentives to employers to undertake meaningful steps to improve workplace protection.

The two parts of H.R. 2937 that are changed in the bill we are introducing today involve: First, making sure that the voluntary programs at OSHA, some of which we are creating or codifying in our bill, receive adequate administrative attention and funding within the agency and increased recognition as an essential part of what OSHA's role is, and second, retaining current law with regard to coverage of State and local governments.

The second point is particularly important to me because of my concern about the Federal Government's increasing reliance in recent years on carrying out its policy objectives through unfunded mandates on State and local governments. Our earlier version of the bill provided for a 3-year delay in coverage of State and local governments, with a cost study of the impact of this change completed within 1 year of passage. The intent was that with the cost study Congress could revisit the issue before coverage was triggered.

Numerous letters from our constituents and others convinced us that the better approach is not to trust that this issue would be revisited after the cost study was done. Instead, the issue of how Congress should treat State and local governments should be dealt with directly in this legislation. We believe that current law, which allows but does not require States to adopt OSHA standards and provides 50 percent of the funding for enforcement and administration if the State seeks and obtains approval of its program by the Department of Labor strikes the appropriate balance between recognizing State's independent role and priorities and protecting worker health. Alternatively, if Congress is determined to impose the OSHA rules on all State and local governments, including schools and other public agencies, then the Federal Government should pay the full cost of the mandate.

We offered both of these choices during the markup of OSHA reform legislation in the Education and Labor Committee, but both were rejected by the majority on the committee. Thus, the OSHA reform bill comes to the House with a clear choice between those who support more unfunded mandates on State and local governments, and those who do not.

TRIBUTE TO FOOD FROM THE 'HOOD

HON. JULIAN C. DIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. DIXON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to a dynamic and enterprising group of Crenshaw High School students who have formed the Nation's first student-owned natural foods company: Food from the 'Hood. Founded in October 1992, Food from the 'Hood has an ambitious company mission that seeks to illustrate the potential of young adults and provide them with jobs, give back to the community, and prove that businesses can be socially responsible and profitable. Remarkably, the students have successfully marketed their first product, Straight Out 'the Garden Creamy Italian Salad Dressing, at over 10 major grocery chains throughout southern California; overall, about 2,000 stores are expected to carry this product. Projected estimates of annual profits total between $100,000 to $200,000, which will go toward scholarships for the student-owners and contributions to local charities.

In response to the Los Angeles disturbances, a science teacher at Crenshaw High School, Ms. Tammy Bird, encouraged her students to restore the school's garden and give the food to the needy. On December 18, 1992, the students reaped their first harvest and donated it to a local food bank, Helpers for the Homeless and the Hungry. While always giving at least 25 percent to the needy, the students also sold produce, enabling them to provide 600 dollars' worth of college scholarships to three graduating students. With the help of Ms. Melinda McMullen, a former marketing executive, the students soon expanded their base and formalized the concept of a student-owned business.

All student-owners participate in an intensive employee development program that, through a points system, determine individual scholarship amounts. Students earn points by working in the business, maintaining high academic grades, and devoting time in college preparatory activities; points can be taken away for not meeting these obligations. Tutoring in math, science, English, and Spanish are also offered. Scholarships are determined by calculating the percentage of total points earned, with a potential for acquiring points worth up to $15,000 a year. Any profits above the scholarship margins will be donated to various community initiatives.

The students' persistence and dedication, combined with the support of Crenshaw High School administrators and faculty, have yielded an enthusiastic response from the community. Their efforts have garnered the patronage

of Mr. Norris Bernstein, the Weingart Foundation, the city of Los Angeles Community Development Department, the California Community Foundation, RLA—formerly referred to as Rebuild L.A.—and countless other businesses and professionals. Nonetheless, in addition to promoting their salad dressing, the students continue to operate the garden and market at Crenshaw High School.

It is a pleasure to recognize the following innovative students who share ownership in Food from the 'Hood: Angelica Becerra, Shannon Burton, Karla Becerra, Marshon Caulton, Seak Chan, Kahlelah Croom, Charo Darwin, Leonie Felix, Dennis Fomond, Jaynell Grayson, LaTosha Hayden, Kristi Hernandez, Zakiya Hill, Ketric Jenkins, Naeisha Jones, Carlos Lopez, Ivan Lopez, Mary Lucas, Rashard MaGee, Maurice McNeely, Brian Morris, Ben Osborne, LaChentia Patton, Natasha Proby, Edwin Rhodes, Kendal Robinson, Michael Santos, Santana Scott, Mark Sarria, Kabeer Smith, Jasmine Talley, Sommer Tillett, Osofu Washington, Luther Waters, and Maria Wilson.

Mr. Speaker, I am extremely proud of Food from the 'Hood's astounding accomplishments, and ask my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in commending the 35 student-owners. In devising a means through which they could further their education and enhance the quality of life within their community, these young entrepreneurs have served as examples for our youth and have provided a source of much-needed hope to the inner-city community of Los Angeles.

BUFFALO SOLDIERS COMMEMORATIVE RIDE OF COL. CHARLES YOUNG

HON. DAVID L. HOBSON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. HOBSON. Mr. Speaker, nearly 80 years ago today during the Great War, Col. Charles Young undertook a 600-mile journey on horseback to Washington, DC, from Xenia, OH, to prove his fitness for service in the U.S. Army.

By the age of 50, Colonel Young had already proven himself as a distinguished soldier in Cuba, the Philippines, Haiti, and the Mexican campaign. And his deeds were a tribute not only to his home State of Ohio, but also to our great Nation.

I am proud to honor this man and many like him whose service to the United States as Buffalo Soldiers—from the time of their service on America's western frontier to the Korean war—went largely unnoticed and unheralded.

Through his outstanding military service, Colonel Young promoted by example the right to equality for himself and every African-American. I honor his courage, not only in the course of battle, but in the course of fighting against discrimination and segregation which was routine in our military's history.

At Arlington National Cemetery today, a ceremony at the gravesite of Colonel Young marks the end of the Buffalo Soldiers' commemorative ride which began in Ohio 4 days ago. Let it also mark the end of racial discrimination in our military and a new beginning for remembering the deeds and the services of America's Buffalo Soldiers.

WELCOME TO THE 26TH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF THE WOUND, OSTOMY, AND CONTINENCE NURSES SOCIETY

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, the Third District of Maryland is proud to welcome the 26th annual conference of the Wound, Ostomy, and Continence Nurses [WOCN] Society to the Baltimore Convention Center on June 19–23. The theme for the conference is "Positioning for Change—Where Do We Go From Here?"

WOCN is a professional association of 3,000 registered nurses who specialize in the care of patients with wounds, ostomies, and incontinence. The WOCN membership consists primarily of ET nurses, formerly known as enterostomal therapists [ET's]. ET nurses traditionally specialized in the care of patients with ostomies; however, as the needs increased for specialists in managing wounds and related skin conditions, ET nurses incorporated wound care into their practice. ET nurses have also extended their practice into the area of continence care, including prevention, assessment, diagnosis, and management.

In addition to these ET nurses, the WOCN membership consists of registered nurses who specialize in only wound or continence care. The WOCN nurse is an integral part of the health care system in providing cost-effective care to their patients.

Participants in the conference will include the WOCN membership, allied health care professionals, and medical and pharmaceutical manufacturers. The conference provides an opportunity for the participants to become more knowledgeable of the practice of the nurse who specializes in the care of patients suffering from wounds, ostomies, or incontinence. The conference aims to identify the current issues and trends that impact professional practice, and to provide a forum in which the participants can discuss such clinical and professional issues. The conference also seeks to provide resources to assist participants in marketing their practice, as well as to recognize available collaborative practice opportunities in various healthcare settings.

The Clinton administration will be represented at the conference by Ms. Kathleen Hastings, consultant to the Surgeon General on health care reform. Ms. Hastings will deliver the conference's keynote address at the opening session on June 20 at 9 a.m.

I am pleased and honored that WOCN has chosen the fine city of Baltimore to host their conference. I sincerely hope my colleagues will join me in wishing WOCN success with their event.

CHURCHVILLE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding junior high schools in Illinois, Churchville, is located in Elmhurst, a fine community in my district.

On May 27 of this year I had the pleasure of addressing their eighth grade students. Their teacher, Robert Caldwell, chairman of the social studies department, asked the students to compose an essay describing why they would like to attend a luncheon with their Congressman.

I have read these essays, and they are indeed interesting. Today I will provide three of them for my colleagues to read, and next week I will provide three more. I commend them to your attention.

WHY I WOULD LIKE TO GO TO LUNCH WITH REPRESENTATIVE HYDE

(By Priscilla Damitrescu)

The reason why I would like to meet Representative Hyde is because I have a strong interest in meeting him. I also would like to find out his point of view on certain matters. Most of all I would like to get to know the person who represents me and my area.

The issues I would like to discuss with Representative Hyde are Health care, the situation in Singapore, certain parts of the Constitution that I hold an opinion on, and I would also like to discuss the gang matter that is starting to move within Elmhurst.

The questions I would like to ask are his opinion on those issues I have listed. I would also like to know what got him to become a politician. I would also ask him questions in general about becoming a politician.

The reasons I think I should be are that I think that I would represent Churchville in a good manner and because I am highly interested in finding out more about politics.

WHY I WOULD LIKE TO GO TO LUNCH WITH REP. HYDE

(By Randy Kuczaj)

I would really like to go to lunch with Rep. Hyde because I would like to talk to him about the issues that are important to me. The main issue is gun control, but there are others such as health care, abortion, and the White Water Scandal. I feel very strongly against gun control and abortion. I also think that President Clinton should come up with a better health care plan. I have a lot of questions that I would like answered about these issues. I would also like to find out how he feels about gun control and what other bills the House is thinking of passing.

Another reason why I would like to go to lunch with Rep. Hyde is that I would like to meet him in person. It is not every day that you get to have lunch with your Representative.

I think I should be chosen because I am a good student and I really could benefit from this experience by learning something new. It would be a honor for me to be chosen.

WHY I WOULD LIKE TO GO TO LUNCH WITH REP. HYDE

(By John Mendola)

I would like to go because there are many questions I would like to ask. Questions about gun control, abortion, and what's it

like to be a representative of our country. I would like to meet Mr. Hyde because I have always been fascinated by government and I would like to meet one of its employees.

The questions I would like to ask are: What do you define as an assault weapon? Are you against abortion and why? I will also ask many other questions.

I think I should be picked because I'm very involved in politics. I would very much enjoy talking to a politician, especially one from our state. I think I would benefit greatly and it would be an event I would never forget. Please consider my application.

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD JOINS WITH THE IMPROVED BENEVOLENT AND PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS OF THE WORLD TO HONOR SPECIAL PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. FORD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Isiah Pierce Norfleet, an exceptional young man and model of courage. Isiah was recently selected to be the 1994 Special People National Poster Child by the Improved Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the World [I.B.P.O.E. of W.]. In this role, Isiah will be representing all special people who have additional needs due to physical or mental challenges.

Although Isiah has cerebral palsy and the left side of his body is partially paralyzed, his medical condition has not dampened his spirits or hampered his accomplishments. Isiah shares the joys and interests of every 5 year old. In school, his favorite subject is music and he would like to enrich his love of the subject of music by learning to play the piano. Isiah enjoys attending church and school and uses his cheerful attitude to touch the lives of those around him. Every morning, he greets his teachers with a big smile and hug.

Isiah has used his lighthearted personality to overcome his disability and conquer adversity. By enjoying the daily delights and activities of a 5-year-old's life, Isiah meets his challenges head-on. The courage and perseverance which Isiah illustrates should set an example for us all.

I would also like to commend the I.B.P.O.E. of W. for their outstanding work on behalf of people with special needs. Through their efforts and interest, the attention of our Nation may be focused on the needs of special people and their unlimited potential.

I encourage my colleagues to join with Isiah, the I.B.P.O.E. of W., and with me to recognize the accomplishments and needs of special people everywhere.

THE CASE OF SEMYON LIVSHITZ

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of this body to the case of Semyon Livshitz, a former Russian naval officer currently serving a 10-year sentence in prison for alleged rape and robbery in Vladivostok.

This is a complicated story, Mr. Speaker. In February 1990, the captain of the ship upon which Livshitz served prior to his release from active duty was accused of rape and robbery. In the course of the interrogation, the captain accused Livshitz of being in the pay of Israeli intelligence, and plotting to hijack a Russian submarine to turn over to the Israelis—sort of a "Red October" scenario. Although the scheme was too farfetched for even the KGB, in August 1990, Livshitz was arrested and accused of being implicated in the rape and robbery cases under investigation in Vladivostok.

For a year and a half, Livshitz was in pretrial detention, under living conditions indicating that jails haven't changed much in the Russian Far East since Chekhov's exposé of the penal colonies on Sakhalin Island exactly 100 years ago.

Suffice it to say that Livshitz' health was seriously impaired by that experience. He and 25 other prisoners were kept in a cell intended for 8 persons, with little light or air. In addition, he reported that he was repeatedly beaten by prison wardens.

In April 1992, Livshitz, along with the ship captain and another sailor, was found guilty by a military tribunal and sentenced to 10 years hard labor. According to Livshitz' lawyer, the investigation and trial were conducted in the best preperestroika Soviet tradition, with threats against victims and codefendants, extortion of gifts and cash from Livshitz' family and friends during the investigation, and an attempt by the judge to persuade a witness to retract his testimony.

The judicial procedure and investigation were so flawed that the sentence was struck down on appeal and a new trial was ordered. Incidentally, the investigating officer in the case was fired for having fabricated much of the evidence.

The retrial, again in a military court, began in February 1993. Observers reported that they felt the defense had made a good case and that "the prosecution was having a hard time grounding its claims." However, on April 22, 1994, the court found all three defendants guilty of rape and robbery, and sentenced them to 10 years in prison. Livshitz' attorney plans to appeal the decision again to the higher military tribunal in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot make a clear determination of Semyon Livshitz' innocence or guilt on what are certainly serious charges, but it surely appears that basic principles of rule of law have been disregarded at the local judicial level in Semyon Livshitz' case.

As cochairman of the Helsinki Commission, the government body mandated by law to monitor and encourage compliance with the Helsinki Accords, I would urge the appeals court in Moscow to examine this case very closely.

MSGR. CHARLES OWEN RICE, 60 YEARS OF SERVICE

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to pay tribute to Msgr. Charles Owen Rice on the 60th anniversary of his ordination as a Catholic priest.

Monsignor Rice has long been a prominent member of the Pittsburgh area community in his various roles as a priest and an outspoken advocate for civil rights and the rights of all working men and women. A lifelong champion of social justice, Monsignor Rice earned a highly respected reputation as a labor priest in the 1930's and his dedication to defending the rights and human dignity of each man and woman has been steadfast for the past 60 years.

Msgr. Charles Owen Rice has served as an inspirational role model for other members of the clergy and for the general population of the Pittsburgh area. His willingness to confront social evils and work for solutions has helped to improve the quality of life in the Pittsburgh area. Across the past six decades, Monsignor Rice has set a standard of personal commitment to the public good that has remained constant regardless of shifting political fashions.

Monsignor Rice grew up in the city of Pittsburgh to which he moved as a child from his native New York City. After graduating from Duquesne University in 1930, he began studying at St. Vincent Seminary. Ordained in 1934, he began a career of pastoral service to various local parishes and the community in general which has continued over six full decades.

As an active local priest during the Great Depression, Monsignor Rice organized some of the church's efforts to help individuals and families in need. He opened St. Joseph House of Hospitality to provide food, clothing, and temporary shelter for hungry and homeless men. Monsignor Rice also emerged as a well-known voice speaking out on the needs of the day as a radio commentator and a columnist for the Pittsburgh Catholic. His career in local radio was to continue for 44 years and his columns still appear regularly in the Pittsburgh Diocese's publication.

At a time when the Great Depression created severe problems for working men and women, Monsignor Rice began a lifelong struggle on behalf of the rights of labor. He emerged as an activist supporter of the American labor movement and addressed labor groups and others at thousands of events. life as a "labor priest was not without controversy at times, but Monsignor Rice's commitment to speaking out on behalf of labor was never shaken and his voice was never silenced.

Father Charles Owen Rice was officially installed as a monsignor in 1964 at a time when the United States was confronting the legacy of slavery and segregation. He was an active participant in the civil rights movement and became widely known as a forceful advocate of the rights of minorities to enjoy the full benefits of citizenship in the United States. He dedicated himself to helping African-Americans in

their effort to gain equal access to quality housing, employment and educational opportunities. Monsignor Rice used his moral voice to promote respect for the civil rights of all Americans and labored steadfastly to confront racial strife and social unrest.

Monsignor Rice also emerged as a committed advocate for an end to the war in Vietnam. He led a large number of antiwar marches and teach-ins. His dedication to working for peace served to place him in the forefront of national efforts struggling to secure an end to the Vietnam war.

St. Vincent Seminary honored Monsignor Rice's lifelong commitment to social justice in 1990 with the creation of a fund to establish a Msgr. Charles Owen Rice Chair of Ethical Studies. At this ceremony, Monsignor Rice was honored for his lifetime of service on behalf of social justice. In additional to his work for labor rights, racial harmony, and peace, Monsignor Rice was saluted for his dedicated work on behalf of prison reform and more recent efforts to help individuals suffering from AIDS. Today, Monsignor Rice continues to lead an active life of service as pastor emeritus to St. Anne Parish, Castle Shannon, and in the community in general.

Mr. Speaker, it is fitting that the assembled Members of the U.S. House of Representatives should have this opportunity to reflect on the lifelong service of an individual like Msgr. Charles Owen Rice. His commitment to social justice and his eloquence in speaking out for the rights of others should serve as an inspiration to everyone who seeks to serve the public.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REFORM ACT

HON. HARRIS W. FAWELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, today I and 23 of my colleagues are reintroducing the Occupational Safety and Health Reform Act. I say reintroducing because the bill is really an updated version of H.R. 2937, which was introduced in August 1993.

When that earlier bill was introduced, I said, on behalf of the cosponsors, that our bill was intended to reflect our ideas of what OSHA reform should look like in general, in contrast to the mandates and penalties in the other OSHA reform bill, H.R. 1280. I said:

We believe that Congress needs to look at a new role for OSHA, combining enforcement and incentives, and using the resources of the Federal Government not simply as the policeman of the workplace but also to encourage and reward employer and employee efforts to improve and maintain high standards for the safety and health of workers. Safe and healthful working conditions and practices are in the interest of both employees and employers. Most employees and most employers recognize that fact. Some do not, and our bill addresses those employers by providing OSHA with necessary enforcement tools to ensure that employee safety and health is not ignored. But for the vast majority of employers, existing Government resources can be better utilized by providing expertise, consultation services, and training, and by encouraging employers and employees to make safety and health a priority in their workplaces.

Shortly after H.R. 2937 was introduced, Vice President GORE's National Performance Review [NPR] report expressed a similar goal for OSHA. To quote the NPR:

We will shift some federal functions from old-style bureaucracies to market mechanisms. We will use federal powers to structure private markets in ways that solve problems and meet citizens' needs—such as for job training or safe workplaces—without funding more and bigger public bureaucracies.

The bill we are introducing today continues, and we think improves upon, this approach to reinvent OSHA—emphasizing cooperation, market mechanisms, and incentives. For the most part, it is identical to H.R. 2937, with two substantive changes—both of which were based upon the comments that we received from many people after the earlier bill was introduced.

The first change from H.R. 2937 eliminates the extension of OSHA coverage to State and local governments. The original bill included such coverage after 3 years and a CBO study of the costs involved, along with a provision providing that fines otherwise assessed against such public agencies would be applied to the costs of abating the violation. Although these provisions were clearly less burdensome on State and local governments than those in H.R. 1280, many communications from my constituents along with, obviously, the increased awareness that all of us have to the burden of unfunded mandates on State and local governments convinced me and my colleagues to exclude this provision altogether and to retain current law.

It should be emphasized that current law does not leave public sector workers without avenues for protection. The policy adopted in 1970 when the OSH Act was passed was that States should be covered but not mandated to enforce OSHA rules in public-sector workplaces. States which do so receive up to 50 percent Federal funding for enforcement activities. Twenty-five States and territories have adopted such a program, while other States have chosen to provide protections in other ways, without the involvement of Federal Government oversight. That policy, we believe, recognizes that States and local governments are separate levels of government and not arms of the Federal Government, and that we ought to avoid imposing more unfunded mandates on already overburdened State and local government budgets.

The second change from H.R. 2937 in the bill we are introducing today would more clearly focus OSHA's efforts to promote and administer voluntary compliance programs. Our intent is that cooperative and voluntary programs should be recognized both within and without the agency as at least as important a part of OSHA's mission as enforcement or setting standards. To do that, the bill would establish a single office within OSHA to coordinate and administer all voluntary programs, including small business consultation, voluntary protection programs, technical and training and workplace-based incentives—and set a floor of at least 25 percent of the agency's budget for such programs.

A section-by-section summary of the legislation we are introducing today is attached. We welcome any comments or questions, as well as cosponsorships, from our colleagues.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF THE REVISED OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH REFORM ACT

Section 1. Short Title.

Section 2. Congressional Coverage. Establishes a program for coverage of Congress and the instrumentalities of Congress comparable to private sector.

Section 3. Standard Setting. Provides uniform criteria for health and safety standards. Requires that standards be based on significant risk, feasibility, a reasonable relationship of costs and benefits, cost effectiveness, and minimized job loss. Requires OSHA to use negotiated rulemaking unless the agency finds that process inappropriate. Provides protections for small business against excessive paperwork and regulatory requirements.

Section 4. Application. Requires OSHA to report to Congress regarding number and types of inspections not conducted because of lack of jurisdiction. Provides that an employee participation program which deals in whole or in part with safety and health is not a violation of section 8(a)(2) of the National Labor Relations Act. Provides that safety and health audits which are done voluntarily by an employer are "privileged" in enforcement actions.

Section 5. Variances. Provides for automatic granting of variance if the application has been pending with OSHA for 180 days and if the inaction is not due to applicant.

Section 6. Inspections. Creates a legal requirement that OSHA inspections be conducted by personnel who are trained and knowledgeable in the industry or type of hazard. Requires OSHA to enter agreements with other enforcement agencies to check for fire hazards and report them to OSHA if the employer fails to correct. Makes permanent the Appropriations language partially exempting small businesses and family farms. Allows OSHA greater discretion in determining which employee complaints must be investigated.

Section 7. Consultation, Incentives, and Technical Assistance. Establishes a central office within OSHA to promote, administer, and coordinate consultation and voluntary compliance programs. Provides exemptions from random inspections and penalty reductions for employers which (1) utilize a third-party consultation program or (2) have a safety and health program and an exemplary safety record. Establishes a recognition and award program for model employers based upon the current Voluntary Protection Program. Codifies small employer consultation program. Provides for additional programs for education, training, and technical assistance. Sets aside at least 25 percent of OSHA budget for programs in this section.

Section 8. Employer Defenses. Codifies and modifies the defense for "employee misconduct." Creates a new defense for employers who have utilized alternative methods which are equally or more protective of employee's safety and health.

Section 9. Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission. Extends the time an employer may contest a citation from 15 days to 30 days. Gives deference to interpretations of law by the Commission.

Section 10. Discrimination. (Whistleblowers) Extends time for filing complaints

from 30 days to 60 days. Provides that if DOL does not decide to prosecute the case within 90 days, the complainant may take the case directly to the Review Commission for hearing and decision. Provides for appeal from Commission decision to Court of Appeals. Encourages use of mediation in such disputes.

Section 11. Enforcement. Retains current requirement that OSHA obtain court order to close down a worksite. Limits OSHA's authority to issue "notice of imminent danger" to 72 hours unless OSHA obtains a court order. Requires OSHA to conduct "special emphasis" programs, working with targeted industry to address special safety or health issues.

Section 12. Penalties. Creates a single civil penalty structure, with higher penalties targeted at violations which have caused death or serious injuries. Changes current criminal violation from a misdemeanor to a felony, and increases the degree of "criminal intent" required. Codifies OSHA policy regarding sharing of information with victims and family members of victims. Allows OSHA to issue warnings in lieu of penalties.

Section 13. State Programs. Requires states to conform labeling, content and hazard information to federal requirements. Provides that OSHA's oversight of state programs will be based on comparisons to federal enforcement rather than arbitrary benchmarks. Allows OSHA to grant waivers to states for alternative programs and approaches.

Section 14. NIOSH. Transfers NIOSH to the Department of Labor.

Section 15. Prevention of Alcohol and Substance Abuse. Requires OSHA to establish uniform federal standards for workplace drug and alcohol testing.

Section 16. Cost Effectiveness Studies. Requires OSHA to contract for studies on the cost effectiveness of standards, and authorizes $2 million per year for such studies.

RECOGNIZING ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF CYNTHIA L. RAEHL, PHAR.D.

HON. SCOTT L. KLUG

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. KLUG. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize the installation of a constituent of mine, Cynthia L. Raehl, Phar.D., as president of the American Society of Hospital Pharmacists during the society's 51st annual meeting in Reno, NV.

With a membership of 30,000, ASHP is the national professional association that represents pharmacists who practice in health-care systems, including hospitals, health maintenance organizations, long-term care facilities, and home-care agencies. The society has extensive publishing and educational programs designed to help members improve pharmaceutical services, and it is a national accrediting organization for pharmacy residency and pharmacy technician training programs.

Even a cursory review of Dr. Raehl's impressive credentials reveals that she has the expertise and leadership to guide the society toward a larger role for pharmacy within a reformed health care system. She holds appointments as professor in the School of Pharmacy, University of Wisconsin, and clinical pharmacist in the cardiology department and coordinator of the ambulatory arrhythmia clinic at the William S. Middleton Memorial Veterans Hospital in Madison, WI.

Dr. Raehl has written or collaborated on 35 articles appearing in refered journals, book chapters and other professional publications. A recognized expert in cardiovascular pharmacotherapy, she has made presentations throughout the pharmacy profession in her community, State, and the Nation. She has also lectured before pharmacists in Turkey, Great Britain, Sweden, Spain, Israel, and the Pharmacy World Congress in Washington, DC.

Dr. Raehl received her undergraduate degree in pharmacy from the University of Wisconsin and, following completion of her 3-year pharmacy residency at the Albert B. Chandler Medical Center, the doctor of pharmacy from the University of Kentucky.

The American Society of Hospital Pharmacists has been an active participant in the health care debate of recent months. I look forward to its continuing leadership under Dr. Raehl's guidance.

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE WILLIAM J. ZLOCH, U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE, SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

HON. PETER T. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, June 17, 1994

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and pay tribute to the Honorable William J. Zloch, a true student-athlete who has gone on to become an outstanding American jurist. At the suggestion of Prof. Charles Rice of the Notre Dame Law School, I want to take this opportunity to offer into the RECORD the remarks of Judge Zloch before the recent Law Day meeting of the Broward County, Florida Bar Association.

As a graduate of Notre Dame Law School and a lifelong fan of the Fighting Irish football team, I can proudly report that William Zloch was the starting quarterback for the 1965 Notre Dame football squad which was ranked among the top 10 in the Nation. Bill Zloch went on from his gridiron triumphs to graduate from Notre Dame in 1966 and Notre Dame Law School in 1971. He also served his country as a naval officer in Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, the members of this institution should note that in his Law Day remarks, William J. Zloch demonstrates why he is a respected member of the Federal judiciary. I encourage my colleagues to take note of Judge Zloch's comments.

LAW DAY SPEECH TO BROWARD COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION

The annual celebration of Law Day provides us with an opportunity to reflect on our United States Constitution and its interpretation by our federal judicial system. In reflecting on this point, I want to put a slightly different perspective on what you may be accustomed to hearing. Isn't the job of a judge to apply the Constitution, as written, according to the intent of those who adopted it, rather than according to his own view of what is useful or just? Didn't Alexander Hamilton warn in The Federalist No. 78 that "The courts must declare the sense of the law; and if they should be disposed to exercise will instead of judgment the consequence would equally be the substitution of their pleasure to that of the legislative body." (emphasis in original).

Federal Judges are tasked with the administration of justice and a debate has raged for thousands of years of human experience as to what is justice, a debate which is raging even today in our society. It is a debate which has basically set forth two diametrically opposed views of what justice is. On the one hand there is the view which unfortunately has found its way, to a large extent, into our society across the board, but also particularly among our leaders in the law and justice profession, that justice is a question of expedience.

William James wrote more than fifty years ago in describing his pragmatic philosophy that the truth, to put it briefly, is merely the expedient to our way of thinking and that which is right is merely the expedient to our way of behavior.

This philosophy has been articulated very well more recently by professors across the country who claim, wrongly I believe, that we, as a society, no longer share unchanging rational values. Nonetheless, they state, it is important that we breathe into our *corpus juris* whatever values we share today irrespective of whether we shared them yesterday, irrespective of whether we share them tomorrow. This philosophy would sever positive law from the unchanging principles of the natural law and it is a recipe for atrocities.

This illustrates a tendency in our system of jurisprudence to depart from the traditional concepts of natural law and to accept and embrace concepts of utility; i.e., that which works today is that which is good, that which is technologically feasible is that which must be done. This is a philosophy that holds that man's worth is measured only by his utility to the material world around him. And, as a corollary to this proposition, so are his habits.

Opposed to that philosophy is the philosophy that justice is something more than acquiescence to whatever may be the social whim of the day. For the wind of favor that blows today may very well turn into the wind of disfavor that blows tomorrow. And justice ultimately is a question of each and every one of us having preserved and protected our fundamental rights. And justice, in turn, is dependent upon each and every one of us being cognizant of our authentic personhood, what it means to be a person, because justice is essentially and ultimately a command of love.

The greater the influence or sovereignty over the affairs of man one has, the greater humility one must bring to the service of man. Our founding fathers in establishing that each of us had certain inalienable rights did so, not out of a burst of sudden and passing civility, but in recognition of the fact that our nation and our form of government and our system of laws was the end point of a bridge that spanned thousands of years back to when God told the prophets, "Before I formed you in the womb I knew you * * *. I have loved you with an everlasting love." (Jer. 1:5, 31:3).

Translated, this means to me that all of us in the law and justice profession must recognize and remember that our personhood stems from our divine origin and our

personhood requires not only that we have recognized for us our fundamental rights and duties but that we recognize our duties to others.

Today, our society is caught up in a parasitism of crime which involves among other things organized narcotics trafficking, pornography, child abuse, money laundering, murder and a decline in morals of unprecedented magnitude and scope. It is a crime wave and moral free fall that no one person seems to have a grasp on and which we all tend to view in the abstract sense. I think if we pause and reflect, we can recognize that one of the reasons for this is that we, as a society, have invited this crime wave and the moral free fall in which society finds itself today. And we have invited it in the sense that we have forgotten or are in danger of forgetting what it is to be a human being or a human person, because if we do not have an authentic definition of personality we are not able at all to define what it is that is good or harmful to our being and to our purpose. I suggest to you that we as a society have been and presently are on a course of conduct that continues to diminish the value of dignity of life. Certainly, when you spend enough time rationalizing acts that are clearly immoral, there then comes a hardening of the heart, of the spirit, and we end up in a moral free fall and facing unwarranted consequences.

Dostoyevsky, in his book, Crime and Punishment, wrote of a dream in which a child views a man beating his horse to death. In literary circles this is referred to as "The Dream of the Suffering Horse," In this dream the protagonist is a child. This horse was an old mare, gaunt and overworked, owned by a man whose job it was to ferry goods to people in a cart around St. Petersburg, Russia. While stopped in front of a tavern, a group of drunken revelers came out of the tavern and jumped into the cart. They demanded that the owner take them away in the cart. At their encouragement and despite the frantic struggling of the horse, the owner began beating the horse to pull the load even though it was too heavy. The child cried and asked his father to intervene and the father said, "It is none of our business." The horse was beaten to death. When the horse died the child ran to it and embraced it and wept over it.

Dostoyevsky at the time that he wrote this novel was criticized as being anti-intellectual. He was not. He was at war with the theories of utilitarianism and social Darwinism which were running amuck in Europe. Dostoyevsky says to us that the man in the dream in killing the horse was actually killing himself.

It is my view that the horse represents the suffering of the innocent. It represents, I think, in a contemporaneous fashion, the suffering of our children in our society. Children, who because we have in so many respects lost the sense of our human identity and human dignity, are being asked to carry, like that horse, a load that they cannot bear. In condoning such action that destroys our children, we in turn destroy ourselves.

I submit that it is important to recognize that justice is not a question of escapements. It is a question of that to which we are all entitled as a matter of natural right. And we will indeed, as a nation, rediscover and reaffirm our respect for the law when we rediscover and reaffirm our respect for ourselves as persons and the value and dignity of life.

We must keep in mind that the law comes from a higher law giver. It is important for a coherent society to keep in mind that God is the ultimate law giver and that the law should be infused with a moral code which comes from God through the natural law, through what the Declaration of Independence called "the Laws of Nature and of Nature's God."

History has shown that when morals decline laws increase in number. However, I submit that the law of itself is not enough. You cannot do it simply with the law. The Lord's Prayer has fifty-six words, the Gettysburg Address has two hundred and fifty-six, the Ten Commandments have two hundred and ninety-seven, and the Declaration of Independence has three hundred words. Some laws that come out of Congress have thousands and thousands of words.

I think that indicates that the law of itself is not enough and the law has to be infused with something else. As Thomas Aquinas stated, it is impossible that the common good should progress unless there is virtue in the citizens and especially in those who administer the law.

In concluding, let me remind you that in September 1789 when the 1st Congress approved the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, they called upon the President of the United States to declare a day of national prayer and thanksgiving. As you also know, each session of the House of Representatives opens with a prayer. In that spirit, I ask you to pray to God for our country and pray to God for guidance for judges and those who exercise offices of leadership.

Thank you.