

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, March 14, 1995

The House met at 12:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SHAYS].

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,  
March 14, 1995.

I hereby designate the Honorable CHRISTOPHER SHAYS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 4, 1995, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leader limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Goss] for 5 minutes.

### STATE OF AFFAIRS AT GUANTANAMO BAY

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I just returned from a quick visit down to Guantanamo Bay in Cuba to see how the situation was there with the Cubans who are in the detaining camps and see how our military is doing, and I have nothing but accolades to give to our military for the fine job they are doing down there under very difficult circumstances. They are running a city of about 36,000 people in reality and they are doing it with very little material and very little preplanning and under difficult circumstances when everybody who is there is not necessarily happy to be there in terms of the Cubans who have left.

Cubans had hoped to go to Miami rather than to Guantanamo Bay, but I will say that the Cubans themselves who are in the camps are doing very well. They are well cared for. I spent a good deal of time with Senator BOB GRAHAM from Florida talking directly with them about their problems. The main complaint of course is the paroling process. The immigration process is too slow and it is moving very, very slowly for the children, the elderly, the

sick among them, and then the big problem, of course, that it does not provide for some 17,000 to 20,000 Cubans who don't really know where they are going to go because there is no process for them and at the present time they are just living in a camp, a tent camp in Guantanamo without too much hope of what is next.

We talked about the problems that they were having in those camps, the remoteness, the feeling out of touch, the medical attention, the priorities, not enough medicine to go around, not enough doctors' visits, the food. Everybody always complains about food in situations like that, but by and large the Cubans are being very, very well cared for and I think Americans can be proud of that.

Improvements are being made. We are putting in food galleys, putting in air-conditioning in some areas, better recreation areas, better bathrooms, getting away from the port-a-potties, better shelters, sturdier tents with hard roofs. This matters because it is a harsh climate down there. It is an area where the wind often blows hard, the windward passage, and it is subject to hurricanes. In fact, some call it Hurricane Alley in that part of the world.

We have dealt with the water problems, the sewer problems and landfill problems, and all of this is going on while there is a very intense opposition to Fidel Castro in these camps that has not diminished in any sense at all, and people who think we should negotiate might want to talk to some of these Cubans down there at Guantanamo about the human rights violations, the suffering, the misery, the economic hardship that the Castro government has put them through, even to the point of death and confiscation.

Right now Fidel Castro is in Europe in a self-rehabilitation program promoting himself and what a great guy he is and he has apparently convinced a few people in Copenhagen and is on his way to meet with the President of France and have some type of a photo opportunity to prove to the world that he has not really done all the bad things that these witnesses in Guantanamo are there to attest that he has done.

What is going on in Guantanamo is not without cost. It costs us about \$20 million a month and it doesn't account for all of the costs we are putting in there. Right now, we are using Navy funds, operational and maintenance funds that the Navy needs for steaming, keeping up our readiness, national

security, defense, as it were, is being used and we are going to have to restore those funds. When we get through, we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars for this problem that Fidel Castro has given to the American taxpayer in the way we are handling it today.

There are some very serious problems staring us in the face right now. What is going to be the future of Guantanamo as a base once it is no longer a refugee camp, I don't know, but we are putting a ton of money in the place so we ought to know. But more important than that, what is going to happen when the long hot summer starts and 17,000 to 20,000 Cubans, mostly young adult males, discover that they really have no place to go and no way to get there. That is not a good situation and those who are working in the camps are very, very concerned about it.

There are probably more visits to the psychiatric side of the medical facility right now than any others by people who are already feeling stressed and as hope begins to erode and the summer gets warmer, it is going to be a very difficult situation and one that we cannot wait to solve itself or erupt.

We need to get ahead of the curve. Senator GRAHAM has a very good idea about shifting the visas that were arranged with the Castro government to apply to those folks in Guantanamo so that they can come here rather than some other folks that Fidel Castro might choose.

Senator GRAHAM makes a convincing case that Fidel Castro has violated the agreement that was made in New York with him at the United Nations because he is already charging a thousand dollars for visas for victims of his regime to leave, which is a real extraordinary—it would be a crime in this country, I guess.

I believe very strongly we should encourage our allies to tighten the embargo. It is extraordinary to me that Mexico and Canada and Venezuela and our good friends in France and Spain are trading only with Cuba, sustaining the Castro regime. There are solutions but we don't have much time. We must deal with the issue that is there.

### WHERE ARE OUR PRIORITIES?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that every American wants, and is demanding that Congress change the way

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

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

it does business. I am committed to changing our spending priorities, and that is what I have been working on. We must cut unnecessary spending, cut waste, and eliminate programs that do not work—like star wars—and we must invest in our citizens and in our communities. That is true national security.

Everyday the Republicans come here to the House floor to talk about their Contract on America and how they are living up to their promises.

To clear up some confusion about exactly what is a contract, I consulted Webster's dictionary. It says that a contract is "a binding agreement between two or more persons \* \* \* a covenant." However, only Republican Members and candidates signed that contract. The American people did not sign that contract. And now the Republicans are not even keeping to their so-called contract.

They promised a vote on term limits to be completed by today. But there was no vote. The majority leaders say "they don't have the votes." That's interesting. For the past 2 months they have been voting in near perfect lock step on every issue that impacts the lives of women, children, and seniors. But when the issue affects themselves, they pull the vote.

The American people want change, but they want a Government that's leaner, not meaner.

After ducking the bill that would affect Members jobs, we are now confronted with a rescission bill where 63 percent of the cuts are in programs that help low-income children and seniors, and not one penny is cut from the Pentagon. Is this what the people said last November? Cut the funds that keep children and seniors out of poverty, but don't touch wasteful Pentagon spending? I don't think so.

America signed a real contract with the men and women in our armed services. But this rescission will cut \$206 million from veterans programs.

Is that what the people asked for last November?

I don't think so.

Why is a phony, one-sided contract more important than a genuine contract signed with our veterans?

To make matters worse, we are not even allowed a real debate on real choices. Is this what the American people said last November? Cut summer jobs, drug-free schools, and low-income heating for seniors, but don't let other choices even be discussed? Doesn't sound very democratic to me.

And lastly, Mr. Speaker, if that wasn't enough, not one penny of these cuts to summer jobs, drug-free schools, and low-income heating for seniors will reduce the deficit. This money taken from seniors and children will go for tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. Taking money out of the pockets of seniors and children, as well as for fu-

ture generations and put it in the pockets of those making over \$100,000. I ask again, is this really what the people said last November?

At last, under the 1993 budget, we finally get the deficit going in the right direction—down. But now we are being asked to do voodoo economics all over again. Increase Pentagon spending. Cut taxes on the rich. Drive up the deficit.

I believe that what the people said last November was they want new priorities. They want us to bring common sense to the decisions we make here.

So I would like to remind my Republican colleagues that all of us have a real and binding contract with every citizen in this country. And that is to make our schools competitive, our streets safe and our communities strong. That is the real contract we have with our citizens. It is not a one-sided agreement.

The people in my home State of Oregon overwhelmingly approved a term limits bill. On the first day of this session, I introduced a term limits bill that mirrors the one Oregonians approved. Numerous States have also overwhelmingly supported term limits. The American people have spoken. They want us to vote on term limits, and they don't want a phony excuse. It is time for the Republicans to honor their own contract and the real contract that we have with the American people.

#### OSHA'S REGULATORY EXCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the American people are frustrated by regulatory process that creates impossible standards. Every day, small businessmen and women are pulling their hair out trying to keep up with unrealistic and overreaching regulatory mandates they cannot possibly comply with. I know that the guardians of the old status quo will scoff at this, but I need only to point to a proposed OSHA rule to make my point.

Mr. Speaker, allow us to consider for a moment OSHA's proposed revision to its confined spaces standard. This applies to people who work in sewers or air ducts or in similarly tight quarters. In the abstract, this is a very reasonable subject for OSHA to be concerned with and employers have a responsibility to workers working in such confined spaces to make sure that their work spaces are as safe as possible.

However, OSHA has taken this a step further. Now OSHA wants to regulate what happens after an accident. If the revised standard is implemented, employers who rely on rescue squads and other outside rescue services to respond to emergencies would have to,

and I quote, "ensure that the outside rescuers can effectively respond in a timely manner to a rescue summons," end quote.

Since most employers do not have an entire team of emergency medical technicians standing on guard at their worksites, it is reasonable to assume that these employers will be dependent upon the performance of professional rescue squads to meet OSHA's standards.

Mr. Speaker, accidents do happen. We funded OSHA to try to cut down the chances that a workplace accident would occur. Now OSHA wants an employer to ensure the rescue of a worker after an accident. What bothers me is OSHA's use of the word "ensure." The word "ensure" places an unrealistic burden on the employer, given OSHA's past behavior.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the bureaucrats over at OSHA have doubts about an employer's desire to ensure a worker's rescue in case of an accident. I have little doubt that employers, often in family businesses, care about their employees, but given OSHA's history, I have serious doubts about allowing OSHA to define when an employer has done enough. I can just see OSHA slapping the employer with a huge fine if a rescue squad gets stuck in traffic.

Even if the employer makes a good-faith effort to provide rescue services, he or she could still be hit with a prohibitive fine if it does not meet with OSHA's ambitious standard.

Mr. Speaker, now OSHA claims that the employers' compliance with this proposed revision will not be based solely upon a rescue service's actual performance during any single incidence, but rather upon the employer's total effort to ensure that the prospective rescue service is indeed capable in terms of timeliness and training and equipment of performing an effective rescue, but what we have seen in the past is that OSHA implements a rule or a standard that sounds very reasonable in the Federal Register or before a congressional hearing; however, when a rule is enforced out in the field, it is used as a big stick to harass hard-working Americans.

Is this just another way for OSHA to fine hard-working Americans and collect more money for the Federal Treasury? Not until a great outcry is heard does OSHA consider providing a clarification of its standards or rules in order to ensure that it is not used to harass hard-working Americans. OSHA has shown again and again that regulatory excess is an addiction and they just cannot seem to kick the habit.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in this case, OSHA's enforcement of its rules does not cause more problems than it is intended to prevent. You can be sure that I will be watching and listening just in case this is not true.

OSHA is one agency that has turned a reasonable and an important mission

into a bureaucratic nightmare for the American economy. Common sense was long ago shown the door over at OSHA. OSHA is one agency that needs to be restructured, reinvented, or just plain removed.

#### BE ALL YOU CAN BE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to take the well today wearing this ribbon which was given to me by the Girl Scouts, because the Girl Scouts today are asking adults to wear this ribbon and be the best that they can be. I think that that is a good motto for all of us as Americans. We probably ought to do it everyday, but this is a special day and I, as an ex-Girl Scout and a mother of a Girl Scout, am very, very proud to be here and be talking about that.

So I got to thinking, well, now, if you took this and applied it to the Federal Government in Washington, why do people get so frustrated with this and what would "be the best we could be" mean at the Federal level?

Well, it seems to me that one of the things that we don't do at the Federal level is model what the average family does at their kitchen table. At the average family kitchen table when times get tough, the last thing they do to make budget ends meet is cut the children. They will try to hold the children harmless from budget cuts absolutely as long as possible, and yet this week, the first thing we are going to do as we try to find the first round of budget cuts, and these are just for big tax cuts and they are for disaster relief in California, we are going to cut children. That is going to be our very first thing, our very first budget cut act. Heaven only knows what we will do to them when we get to the next round where we are dealing with the deficit.

Now I remind you that children did not cause this deficit, nor are they asking for big tax cuts. They would just like a school lunch, thank you, and they did not cause the disaster in California or other places. But I think the thing that is really harming and the reason I think our priorities are so wrong right now is that while this body has been discussing risk assessment, risk assessment, risk assessment, and we were doing this all across the board when it came to regulations, and many people agree, yes, we should look at that, but why are we not looking at the risk assessment on the next generation of children which will people America's 21st century if we continue on with these budget cuts?

Now, what are some of the things that we know? When I chaired the

Committee on Children, Youth and Families, we had all sorts of CEOs from corporate America join us looking at the cost-effectiveness of Federal dollars spent for children, and the best money you can save is investing in a young child, because you are saving it later on, saving it later on.

We got all sorts of incredible numbers that are a big surprise. If you vaccinate every child—and as you well know, America is way behind in vaccinating children, many Third World countries do a much better job—the studies we have been showed is that it is \$14 to the taxpayer later on. So one dollar for a vaccination, every one dollar spent on that saved \$14 later on. That is not a bad deal. I have never been able to invest my money like that in any other area.

When you put children into Head Start, for every dollar we spent on Head Start, you could show a \$6 saving in special education that the taxpayer would pick up. For feeding children, for every dollar you spent in WIC and for every dollar you were spending in child nutrition programs, you way more than made the money back in not having to spend it in Medicaid.

You know, we go around all the time, too, saying children must say no to this, children must say no to this, and that is what we are doing. We are taking a lot of the same "yes to's" away.

We are totally taking away summer jobs. We are taking away many of the youth programs. We are cutting back many of the others so that localities are going to be really strapped, and I must say, as the prior gentlewoman from Oregon said, when you are taking 63 percent of these cuts out of a group of programs that only make up 12 percent of the discretionary budget. I think we are going down real heavy on the kids.

This is not across the board. We are not going after \$600 toilet seats. Oh, no, those are sacred cows. We are not going after other things. No, no, those are sacred cows. Why? Because they have political action committees that can come protect them with all sorts of money for campaigns. They can organize and they can vote.

Children don't vote. They don't have political action committees, and I think if we are going to be the best that we can be, we have got to reconsider these cuts this week because I think it is really—maybe you think it is penny wise, but it is long term and pound foolish.

#### RESCISSION CUTS ON JOBS PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about two programs. First this week we will be considering a rescission bill and the activities that I was involved in over the weekend, but also talk a little bit about the School Lunch Program. But first let me talk about the rescission bill that Congress will be voting on this week.

This last Saturday in Houston, I had the opportunity to, at 8 o'clock in the morning, to go to our city hall in the city of Houston and see hundreds of young people and not so young people who were there at 8 o'clock on a Saturday morning getting prepared to go out and work in the community.

The rescission bill we are going to vote on this week will definitely cut part of the national service, the Americorps Program that serves Houston, and I have served Houston Program in Texas. We started with really no program last year and we have become such a great serving institution for the community.

Let me talk about the Corporation for National Service on a nationwide basis and then bring it down to how it affects Houston: AmeriCorps, Learn and Serve, and the Senior Corps. They work full or part-time in local organizations addressing community needs. We have 60 of them in Houston that serve Houston, 60 positions. I wanted more but we couldn't do it as a startup, 33,000 more with 1995 moneys and 47,000 more with 1996 moneys, but again, the rescission bill will cut us back.

This would complete the contract that a bipartisan Congress made with our young people with the National and Community Service Fund Act of 1993, but we cannot do it if we pass the rescission bill this week with those cuts.

Learn and Serve America, elementary and high school and college students participate in activities that address community needs and they enhance their own academic skills. Approximately 375,000 elementary and secondary school and college students participate, growing to over \$588,000 if we had the 1996 funds.

The Senior Corps, Americans 55 or older serve in local communities on a part-time basis and they provide, for example, modest stipends for foster grandparents, and I have received a lot of mail and phone calls this week from senior companions, 480,000 seniors participate today, and if we could take it out of the rescission bill, we would be able to increase that just a small amount to 510,000.

The cuts in the Americorps is wrong and should not be because it is one of the best programs we have. If we are really going to reform welfare, we need to make sure we reform it by giving people that job experience and those jobs.

Let me talk about another example of the Saturday I was with the Summer

Jobs Program that is sponsored by Houston, works at the cooperative effort in a number of our local governments. We have 2,000 jobs in my district that are summer jobs that are part of that program, 6,000 in Harris County alone. And my concern, by the rescission bill that cuts those 6,000 jobs, we are going to lose out and three or four individuals who were there Saturday who were graduates of the Summer Jobs Program.

We have a young lady, Marilena, who now works at a radio station in Houston who got her start in the Summer Jobs Program. Wilbert, who now is a supervisor for the city of Houston in waste water, got his start in a summer jobs program. Laquista is a young lady who made the news in Houston who got her start working at a summer jobs program and now is supervising clean-up in our community for the city of Houston. Arti, who not only works in my office, but is also a student who got her start in the Summer Jobs Program.

Too often we hear that the majority party now says that there is no benefit to these summer jobs program, but there is a benefit, and Saturday morning I had four people who were graduates who are now productive citizens today because of the Summer Jobs Program. And to cut out 2,000 young people in my own district or 6,000 in the county or thousands all over the United States for a 6-week Summer Jobs Program is wrong because what we are doing is we are having some short-term savings that provides for some short-term tax relief; but in the long term, the American people in our country will lose the values of those talents of those young people whether it be in the Summer Jobs Program and productive citizens or whether it be in the Americorps and Serve Houston where we are losing not only their talents now in helping our community, but we are going to lose the experience they are getting now through Serve Houston and through Americorps for the future of our country.

We cannot be penny wise and pound foolish and lose that effort right now. And that is my concern, that the Congress this week needs to make sure that we do not cut these programs out of the rescission package. We do not need to cut those programs now and say we are going to provide for additional tax cuts now and cut out those 2,000 young people in my own district who have a summer job for 6 weeks.

□ 1300

#### THE RESCISSION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was in Twinsburg, OH, in

my district, Ohio's 13th District in northeast Ohio, visiting the community center and meeting with parents, children, teachers, and nurses and talking about the Women, Infants and Children's Program and the School Lunch Program.

Some of the people I met with, some of the parents, were unemployed. Most of them were working part-time or full-time, generally for minimum wage. Often many of these parents, basically all of those parents' children were getting school lunches, because their income was not high enough that they paid full price for these lunches.

Those parents, those teachers, those children, especially those nurses, could simply not understand why extremists in this body, in Congress, want to cut school lunches, want to cut senior nutrition, want to cut programs like Women, Infants and Children; Programs that have been in effect, in terms of the School Lunch Program, for literally five decades, started by Harry Truman in 1946.

Other programs, like WIC, that have been in effect and working for a couple of decades. Programs that help young people grow, help pregnant women, help those children with nutrition and counseling. The WIC program, especially. And this was what was called a WIC center in Twinsburg.

The WIC Program is not just a giveaway program. It is a program where working class mothers come in with their children, come in while they are pregnant and get some nutritional supplements and are counseled, generally less educated women are counseled about nutrition while they are pregnant to make sure they have a healthy baby. The, after the baby is born, for the next 5 years they come into WIC regularly and are counseled about nutrition and can get immunized, either there or are directed where they can get immunized in the first 2 years of the baby's life; all the things that we need for the future of this country.

These people did not understand why the extremists in Congress want to make these cuts. What they did understand is that School lunches, Children's nutrition Programs, programs like counseling for WIC, immunizations, all these things are the investment for the future and they make sense for this country.

They do understand that, OK, we might save a few dollars making cuts now, but in the end, long term, we will pay more money for welfare for children as they get older and have bad nutrition and did not have the advantages when they were younger. They are more likely to be on welfare and more likely to be in prison. And these young families did understand that. That that simply is bad public policy long term.

I am a deficit hog. I voted for budget cut after budget cut after budget cut in this body. But we should not be stupid

about it. There is no reason to make cuts that affect our children and affect our future the way that cutting school lunches and cutting programs like WIC and nutrition programs like that would mean.

Three weeks ago this body passed an increase in military spending of \$3.2 billion. The extremists here are cutting nutrition, children's long-term-for-the-future programs on the one hand and increasing military spending \$3 billion on the other hand, for a military in a country where our military budget is larger than the next nine countries in the world. Yet we are increasing military spending, cutting school lunches and WIC Programs, and at the same time the extremists in this body want to see major tax cuts for the wealthiest taxpayers.

Just recently the Republican leaders in the Committee on Ways and Means have called for an end to the alternative minimum tax. You may remember about 10 years ago President Reagan and most of the country were outraged that many large corporations in this country were able, through all kinds of use of accountants and lawyers and all their tax breaks and loopholes, literally to avoid paying any Federal tax and sometimes actually getting the government to pay them money through some rebate programs.

Many large corporations fell into the category. So Congress and President Reagan enacted something called the alternative minimum tax to make sure that every large corporation in this country did, in fact, pay some corporate income tax to the Government. They want to eliminate that alternative minimum tax. On the one hand we are increasing military spending, we are eliminating a tax on major corporations—these are corporations that have \$250 million or larger in assets—and we are cutting Nutrition Programs and School Lunch Programs and WIC Programs.

In the other end of that, they want to give capital gains tax breaks which will go to the richest 1 or 2 or 3 percent in this country, in large part. The great majority of capital gains, 87 percent of capital gains cuts, go to the wealthiest people in this country.

This whole Contract With America disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, because it is transferring money from the middle class to the rich. It doesn't make sense and I ask for the defeat of the rescission bill this week.

#### UNHEALTHY KIDS DO NOT MAKE A STRONG AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that many of my Republican colleagues

were busy this past weekend, as were by colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle. I wish some of my Republican colleagues who have proposed these cuts in programs might have accompanied me on my trip through Illinois.

My first stop was at a convention in Chicago sponsored by the Illinois Education Association, one of the largest groups of teachers in our State. Almost a thousand teachers met for a 3- or 4-day conference in Chicago to talk about issues on their mind.

I sat down for breakfast in Chicago with Gary Jones, a high school teacher in Troy, and Cindy Klickna from Springfield, IL, and I said, "What is different about this convention?" And they said, "The budget moved through quickly and we are glad to see that. But there is another thing that started coming up in the course of these conversations which is becoming more and more popular." And I said, "What is that?" And they said, "Security in schools."

Teachers who for years have been meeting and talking, scarcely talked about the question of security of teachers and students in schools. But now it has become an issue of paramount importance, not only in the city of Chicago but across the State.

All of us understand as we read in the newspaper about violence among kids. Children bringing knives and guns to school. Unfortunate and tragic incidents involving injury and death, schoolchildren one to another and threats to teachers. This is today's reality.

The reason why this is relevant is that this week on this floor of this House of Representatives we will be considering a Republican rescission bill, which is a spending cut bill, which will cut money for what is known as Safe and Drug-Free Schools. Money that we have put into a special account in the Federal Government to give to school districts to figure out ways to make it safer for our children and grandchildren to go to school.

I wish we didn't have to do this. I wish we could put the money into computers and teachers. But every one of us knows in our heart of hearts that more than anything we want our kids coming home at the end of the day safe. Safe. And yet we are going to cut millions of dollars out of that.

The Republicans believe this is thoughtful; this is sensible. They don't think this investment is necessary. I wish a few of them could sit down with the teachers in today's schools who will tell you that taking the weapons out of schools, stopping the fighting in schools, and ending the drugs that are starting to permeate all of our kids' culture is really the key to security and the key to America's future and readiness.

I went back to Springfield, IL, which is in my district, and had another

meeting and this meeting consisted of people representing the WIC Program, day-care homes, and school lunch programs. My friend the gentleman from Ohio, SHERROD BROWN, has talked about the school lunch program. I will not dwell on it.

At that meeting we talked a lot about what day care means to working mothers and fathers. A young couple in their 20's came in to see me with their children; one was 3 and another in a toddler seat. Both of them are working, and that is not unusual in America today, and they depend on quality day care to take care of their kids while they are off to work.

The Republican proposal on welfare reform is going to cut the nutrition grants which we give to day-care centers and homes across America. This is in the name of saving money. What these families told me was: Congressman, if the cost of day care gets up too high, it does not make sense to work. We are working to pay day care. We want to work. We want to pay taxes and we want to improve our lives and buy our homes and prepare for our future. But do not make an additional burden on day care, which is literally going to pull the plug on a lot of working families.

In Quincy, a week ago, there was a woman working 45 hours a week in fast food who had her daughter in day care who said, "If you are going to raise my day care bill 20 percent, I have to stop and really think does this make sense anymore?"

In the midst of a welfare debate we should be encouraging people to work. We should be helping them to stay on the job. We should not be increasing the overhead costs of going to work.

The same thing is true on the WIC Program. Here is a program which is a dramatic success—40 percent—40 percent of the infants in America are in our Federal WIC Program. And you know why it is such a big program? It works.

We have dropped the infant death rate in America. It should go even lower, but we have dropped it dramatically because we bring in pregnant mothers. You meet early on with a counselor who says, "Here are the things you should put in your diet to have a healthy baby. And here are the things to avoid: Alcohol, narcotics and tobacco, especially."

And it works. We know it works. It is a proven success. And yet, the Republicans are coming in with their new vision of America to cut out these programs and reduce the amount of money we put in them. You know when we are going pay for that cut? Generations to come. Unhealthy kids do not build a strong America. We have got to stick with the programs that work. And I hope my Republican colleagues will get back to their districts and take a look around.

#### THE RESCISSION BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentlewoman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider the rule and the bill on rescissions. That \$17 billion cut will begin to fundamentally change the way the Federal Government acts and responds, but more importantly, will begin to change the fundamental way we respond to Americans.

While I suspect both will pass, I intend to oppose both the rule and the bill. The rule is too restrictive. First, it only allows the restoration of programs through other cuts within the same chapter. And second, the rule restricts cuts to those programs already proposed to be cut. In short, the rule is designed to ensure that the disproportion in cuts proposed cannot be changed.

According to the analysis of the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, low-income people will bear 63 percent of the cuts, where they only account for 12 percent. And over 12 percent of the total budget is paying 63 percent of the cuts proposed. The rule makes it virtually impossible to correct that imbalance of the shift of more burdens to the poor.

I cannot support such a rule, Mr. Speaker. Again, I cannot support such a rule that reverses in such a basic and elemental way the way in which we provide for the quality of life for the poor that Americans have come to expect and in fact, have come to rely upon.

The rescission bill would change how poor people eat, where poor people live, and where the poor people work, and what they can learn, and where they can travel, and how poor people can attend to their health care when they are in need.

It should be noted that the quality of life for poor people cannot be changed significantly or dramatically without affecting the quality of life of all of us. We all live in America and as they are affected, we are also affected.

If poor become poorer in our society, the resources from those of us who are affluent and rich certainly will be drained. If poor people are not involved in the mainstream of our economy, the mainstream of America will suffer as a consequence of that.

In our blind rush to change things, it seems that we are ignoring these changing factors. To review some of these changes, let's consider that again according to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the low-income elderly will be the hardest hit by a rescission. Why? Because the low-income energy assistance program will be eliminated from these cuts. More than half of a million senior citizens will no

longer have assistance in the cold of winter for heating purchases.

Also the low-income housing assistance program will also be drastically reduced. Poor children will be hit very, very bad by this bill. Excluding the housing and the energy assistance programs, \$5 of every \$6 proposed for the cut will affect children and youth. Children and youth thus far will face a double hit, because they also are assisted by the assistance for housing and also for fuel assistance.

More importantly, to receive no assistance means that low-income families with children must bear a disproportionate burden. The availability of housing for the poor will be made far more difficult if, indeed, the rescission package goes through.

These are fundamental changes in the quality of life of our citizens. While poor children will be cold, they may also be malnourished. Despite facts and statements to the contrary, more cuts in nutrition will indeed, occur, Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the opposing side is saying that that will not happen.

Consider this fact: The WIC Program will be cut by \$25 million in this rescission package, even before we get to the welfare reform next week. So to suggest that we are not cutting, we are going to make sure that children, pregnant women, and the very small suffer the most.

Why are we doing this? Where is the rationale for making these drastic cuts? In a sense, Mr. Speaker, we are imposing unfunded mandates on the States. I submit to you, by cutting these funds we are shifting the burden from the Federal Government to the States. And it will be, indeed, the expectation of the poor and those who have come to rely on these, they will now go to the States or to their local Governor expecting them to bear up this burden.

The States will have very little, I suspect, in responding to those who are cold in the winter, who are ill-housed. Therefore, Mr. Speaker we should not be doing this.

Funding for safe and drug-free schools, as my colleague has just mentioned to you, will be drastically cut. Some \$482 million will be lost, including \$9 million, Mr. Speaker, from my State of North Carolina. And for those lucky enough to receive training, they will not have jobs to go to because transportation will be cut.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the rescission bill really is a contract for disaster for poor people in America.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no further requests for morning business, pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

#### PRAYER

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

Pour down upon us, gracious God, the mercies and the judgments of Your word. Where we have missed the mark, grant us correction; where we have denied Your spirit and gone our own way, grant us forgiveness; when we have spoken the truth and done good works, give us encouragement; when we feel alone or in need of Your healing care, grant us Your abiding peace. We place before, O God, our prayers and the secret petitions of our hearts asking that Your word speak to us in the depths of our being. In Your name, we pray. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HASTERT] objects to the vote on the ground that quorum is not present and makes the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, further proceedings on the question will be postponed until 5 o'clock this afternoon.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. FUNDERBURK] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FUNDERBURK 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.

#### APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS OF REVIEW PANEL OF THE OFFICE OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Pursuant to the provisions of rule LI, the Chair appoints to the review panel of the Office of Fair Employment Practices the following employees of the House of Representatives: Ms. Elizabeth Haas, legal counsel, Office of the Clerk; and Mr. Randy Johnson, workplace policy coordinator, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

#### REPUBLICAN CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, our Contract With America states the following:

On the first day of Congress, a Republican House will require Congress to live under the same laws as everyone else; cut committee staffs by one-third; and cut the Congressional budget.

We kept our promise.

It continues that in the first 100 days, we will vote on the following items: A balanced budget amendment—we kept our promise; unfunded mandates legislation—we kept our promise; line-item veto—we kept our promise; a new crime package to stop violent criminals—we kept our promise; national security restoration to protect our freedoms—we kept our promise; Government regulatory reform—we kept our promise; commonsense legal reform to end frivolous lawsuits—we kept our promise; welfare reform to encourage work, not dependence; family reinforcement to crack down on deadbeat dads and protect our children; tax cuts for middle-income families; Senior Citizens' Equity Act to allow our seniors to work without Government penalty; and Congressional term limits to make Congress a citizen legislature.

This is our Contract With America.

#### BLOCK GRANTS DO NOT FEED CHILDREN

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

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, after just 67 days in power, the Republicans are now known as the party that cut school lunches.

Today, they are actually trying to convince us that block grants will be better for children.

But that is not what they said in the past.

In 1982, Congressman WILLIAM GOODLING said, and I quote: "a child's nutrition needs do not vary from State to State."

Senator BOB DOLE said: "The nutrition area is one that does not easily lend itself to State responsibility" and added "It is appropriate that the Federal Government retain primary responsibility for nutrition programs."

And Speaker, GINGRICH himself co-sponsored a resolution which said, and I quote, "the Federal Government should retain primary responsibility for the child nutrition program and such programs should not be included in any block grant."

Mr. Speaker, block grants do not feed children.

Republicans understood that in the past. But now that they need the money to pay for their tax cuts for the wealthy, they seem to have forgotten.

Well, I promise you this, Mr. Speaker: the American people will not forget.

#### PUT THE FARMER FIRST

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

Mr. FUNDERBURK. Mr. Speaker, I have often said that farmers are the backbone of my district. The Second District of North Carolina from Rocky Mount to Dunn is the second largest producer of tobacco in America. We also have hundreds of soybean, peanut, and livestock farms. Unfortunately, Washington treats these hard working Americans like criminals. It taxes and regulates them.

A classic example of Washington's war on farmers is the tax penalty the IRS imposes on those who pass farmland down to their family members. Farmers have 2 years to notify the IRS that someone has died.

The catch is that the IRS has not made hundreds of farm families aware of this requirement. For farmers who do not have time to read the IRS fine print, the tax police demand back taxes and penalties which are so severe, that these farmers are now in the position of having to sell their farms to pay the tax man.

Mr. Speaker, the farmer has had enough—enough of interference, enough of redtape, and enough of the IRS. Let us do something right for the men and women who put the food on the table. For starters let us pass H.R. 501, which allows farm families to hand their farms down from each generation without fear of the IRS.

#### FREEDOM OF CHOICE ON BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, this is a place where we come to make choices. Many of us, both Republican and Democrat, are ready to make choices to reduce the Federal budget, but today in the Committee on Rules, the Republican leadership of the Committee on Rules is ready to deny us a choice, a series of choices, that the American people have a right to hear us make.

This week on this floor, we will have presented to us a \$17 billion budget cut proposal by the Republican majority. Some of us agree that the budget ought to be cut, but ought to be cut in different places. We want to offer an amendment that would say: "Let us not take home heating assistance away from senior citizens across this country; instead, let us take the money from the S&L bailout. Let us not take money away from reading teachers for children across this country; let us take the money from energy subsidies to huge multinational corporations.

We are not going to get the right to make that choice unless the rule proposed by the Republican leadership is defeated. Honor your Contract With America, open up the promise, and defeat this rule.

#### REPUBLICANS PROMISE DELIVERY ON FIGHT TO PRESERVE THE AMERICAN DREAM

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, you will hear a lot of whining, weeping, and gnashing of teeth on the other side of the aisle in the coming days. You see, the liberal Democrats just cannot accept that under our Republican tax relief plan, Americans will actually be allowed to keep more of their own money.

The liberal Democrats think all money belongs to the Government.

They think the Government needs the money more than working families do.

They think Government does a better job of spending your money than you do.

And they cannot accept that the bloated bureaucracy will be reduced to pay for much-needed tax relief.

They think Government should be even bigger.

They think Government does just a wonderful job of delivering services.

They think the Government needs a raise.

But Republicans will put Government on a diet. We will read every

page, check every line, and challenge every figure in a search to cut waste, fraud, and abuse.

This is nothing less than a fight to preserve the American dream for our children. And we will deliver.

#### THE SHAMEFUL REVERSE ROBIN HOOD POLITICS OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, why are Republicans cutting school lunches for our children, heating assistance for our seniors, and health care for our veterans? To pay for yet another tax cut for the wealthy.

Last week we finally got a look at the Republican tax giveaway, and we found that 50 percent of the benefits of the Republican tax cuts go to people making \$100,000 or more. The capital gains cut is worth \$8,000 to families making \$200,000 or more, while working middle class families making \$30,000 or less would only get a tax cut worth \$92.

Mr. Speaker, I say to my colleague who just spoke, yes, that is a fact, it is a diet, it is a diet for the working middle class families of this country. Cutting services for the most vulnerable to benefit the most privileged 2 percent of Americans is wrong. The reverse Robin Hood politics of the Republican Party is shameful.

#### TELL THE AMERICAN PEOPLE THE TRUTH

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

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I have come to the floor of the House to confront my Democratic colleagues who seem more intent on distortions, regarding the future of the School Lunch Program, rather than promoting the health and safety of our Nation's most precious asset—our children. I hope these individuals abandon hollow political rhetoric and tell the American public the truth. The Republican plan is growing school meals by 4.5 percent. Tell the American people the truth. By the year 2000, we will be spending \$1 billion more on school lunches than today. Tell the American public the truth, Republicans are cutting out Federal bureaucrats and bringing school lunches closer to home.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of our children, let us hope the Democrats end this partisan charade and tell the truth about the Republican school lunch proposal—increased funding, more meals for the children who need them, and fewer Federal bureaucrats micromanaging our lives.

### MEXICO DOES NOT DESERVE COMMENDATION FOR THEIR WAR AGAINST DRUGS

(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, 2 out of every 3 tons of cocaine that comes into America comes from Mexico and through Mexico. Brown Mexico heroin is as plentiful in American cities at times as jelly beans. Three assassinations in Mexico were recently now attributed to the drug cartel down there in Mexico.

It has gotten so bad Mexicans are running across the border with backpacks full of cocaine and heroin, and guess what, the administration commended Mexico for their war against drugs.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. Commending Mexico for their war against drugs is like commending Iran for their record on terrorism. I think NAFTA has taken on a whole new meaning. It now should be known as the "Narcotics Anonymous Federal Treatment Administration," and believe me, we need it.

I think the truth is, I remember when the administration gave a pat on the back to Gen. Manuel Noriega for his efforts on drugs. Think about that one a while.

### THE IMPORTANCE OF BIODIVERSITY

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

Mr. GILCREST. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to discuss an interesting story about the Endangered Species Act. As the Resources Committee begins to hold hearings on this issue, it is imperative that important facts about endangered species and biodiversity be known. The ESA is vital to maintaining our natural resources and to maintaining our quality of life.

I would like to illustrate this by discussing an endangered plant called the Lake Placid scrub mint which is found in only 300 acres in Central Florida. Scientists discovered that insects were not eating this rare plant. With further analysis, scientists found the plant contained a strong natural insect repellent called trans-pulegol, as powerful as any known insect repellent. The possibilities for agriculture are enormous.

Scientists also discovered a symbiotic fungus growing on the plant which had evolved only in association with this plant and therefore, was an extremely rare fungus. More analysis found this fungus produced an agent which had strong antifungal properties, with potential for pharmaceutical uses.

What are the real-life implications of discovering such agents in rare plants? Curing an array of diseases.

The \$79 billion pharmaceutical industry relies on natural resources for 40 percent of its prescriptions. Rare plants and animals may very well hold the key to curing the common cold, AIDS, and cancer.

### URGING MEMBERS TO COSPONSOR LEGISLATION TO OPEN FEDERAL HEALTH CARE CHOICES TO SMALL BUSINESS EMPLOYEES AND TO SELF-EMPLOYED AMERICANS

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I am wearing this blue ribbon because the Girl Scouts today are asking everyone to be the best that they can be, and to take some kind of a pledge to try and make our communities better.

One of the things I would hope Members would do would be to seriously consider cosponsoring the bill I have, because I think it would make Americans' lives better. What would it do? I have a bill that would allow anyone who works for a small employer or who is self-employed to be able to bid off the same Federal menu of health care choices we as Members of Congress get to, the President gets to, and Federal employees get to.

Boy, would that give people some choices and put them in a large pool where their premiums would be much more reasonable.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this editorial in Roll Call this week talking about how the Speaker of the House has put on the payroll once a year for \$100 his fundraiser, so she could have access to that health care.

Let us avoid this. Let us let everyone have it, and let us move on.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

#### THE \$100 A YEAR CLUB

Her fundraising services were worth \$16,000 to Rep. Newt Gingrich's (R-Ga.) campaign between 1990 and 1993; helping Gingrich's Congressional staff learn how to answer constituent mail brought Nancy Bocskor a measly \$100 a year. So, why did she bother? The hundred bucks Bocskor earned on Gingrich's payroll enabled her to maintain her participation in the federal employees' health care plan—a far cheaper and better alternative than buying private insurance (Roll Call, March 9). Nothing wrong with that, says Gingrich spokesman Tony Blankley. It's all legitimate under the rules. The question, Blankley says, "is whether the procedures should be changed, if somebody thinks they are not correct." Well, we do. Bocskor is a political fundraising consultant, not a real Hill employee. She shouldn't gain access to official benefits just because she performed a minor—though politically valuable—service to Gingrich. Neither should anybody else in the \$100 a year club.

### ENCOURAGING MEMBERS TO JOIN IN SPECIAL ORDER ON TIMBER SALVAGE

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

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, time permitting, I will be giving a very important special order on timber salvage, an issue that is vital to my district and the West.

I will explain at length the necessity of salvage and the benefits to the environment, economy, and Federal budget.

I invite everyone to watch in preparation for tomorrow's debate. We will be embarking on a course that brings our timber policy back to sanity.

For too long we have fought battles against those whose idea of preservation is pickling our national forests and putting them on a shelf with a do not disturb sign. It is time to wake up and change this destructive mentality.

Tonight, I, along with several of my colleagues, will try to dispel some of these myths. I am looking forward to this opportunity and encourage as many as can to join me.

□ 1415

### REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one more plea for reason and justice in the fiscal decisionmaking process of the 104th Congress. Mr. Speaker, through the rescission process, to immediately cut the Summer Youth Employment Program is a reckless and barbaric act. First, planned school lunch cuts and now the overnight zero in the budget for summer teenage employment. This savage cut again dramatically demonstrates the Republican contempt for the work ethic. We say we want the poor to work and then we wipe out the Jobs Program for teenagers. Instead of saving money by compounding the sense of hopelessness among our youth, let's save money by cutting the *Sea Wolf* submarine; let us cut the CIA and the intelligence budget from \$28 to \$14 billion.

If we cut farm price supports in half we could save \$8 billion. If we discontinue the unnecessary manufacture of the F-22 fighter plane we could save \$17 billion over the next 6 years. Using reason and a sense of justice there are effective cuts that can be made to reduce the Federal budget. But the hi-tech barbarian approach is a dishonest approach, an overwhelming bully power approach. Fiscal decisionmaking in the 104th Congress is now so lopsided that it is becoming a form of legalized

corruption. Let us please stop the madness now.

#### THE NEW SALT II

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, it is time for a nuclear moratorium, a moratorium on the thermo-nuclear rhetoric spouted by the Democratic White House and those who continue to defend the failed welfare state and skyrocketing deficits.

We talk of transforming the poor. They hold up children. We want to end subsidized illegitimacy. They hold up children. We talk about giving more flexibility to the States. And they hold up children.

Mr. Speaker, have they no shame? Children cannot and should not be used as political shields. We have the moral obligation to our children to reduce the deficit and reform welfare. It is because we care about saving the future for our children and grandchildren, and it is because we know that our children do matter that we are taking on the difficult tasks of cutting the Federal bureaucracy. We are willing to make the difficult decisions.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to sign the new SALT II treaty. S. Stop the rhetoric. A. Assume responsibility. L. Limit the bureaucracy. T. Tackle the problem. The nuclear rhetoric must end.

#### REPUBLICAN BUDGET CUTS

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

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, hearing about salt, I can only think of child nutrition. I can only think of our School Lunch Programs. I can only think about what we have heard from the people who are supporting and who are committed to one thing and one thing only, and, that is, this Republican contract.

They hate it when we stand up here, those of us who are fighting for our working families, and remind them that a cut is a cut if it does not meet the need. The need is what the goal is here, the need of our children to have a hot meal at school because that may be the only place they get it.

If you raise by 4.5 percent the money that is being spent, that is still not an increase if the need has gone up by more. If you cap that increase at 4.5 percent and the need does in fact go up by more, you are taking food from the mouths of our children. That is not what the voters have sent us here to do.

#### TAYLOR-DICKS EMERGENCY TIMBER SALVAGE AMENDMENT

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

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, much of our national forests in the West are sick and dying. Drought, disease, insects, and fire are killing our forest in epidemic proportions. Some forests are already 60 and 70 percent dead. We must restore the health of our forests before it is too late. The best way to do this is to remove the source of sickness as soon as possible. Insects and disease cannot kill living trees if we remove the infested trees from the forest. Dead brittle trees cannot become the kindling for wildfire if we extract them from overstocked timber stands. Mr. Speaker, if we really want to preserve our forests, then we must act now. The Taylor-Dicks emergency timber salvage amendment to the supplemental appropriations bill before the House this week will curb the death cycle in our forest. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this crucially important amendment.

#### REPUBLICAN RESCISSIONS PACKAGE

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Contract With America is not with middle class America. It is a contract to help well-to-do and corporate America. The middle-class hard-working people of this country are going to be paying for Republican tax cuts for the wealthy.

Here are the facts. Republicans will cut funding for every American who wants to choose educational television programs. Republicans will cut funding for veterans, for medical equipment that vets need even though more veterans need medical help. Republicans will cut funding for students by cutting drug-free schools, summer jobs for youth, academic scholarships, a total of \$1.7 billion in education cuts.

Mr. Speaker, it is virtually certain that none of these cuts will go for deficit reduction.

Mr. Speaker, instead the savings will go to finance a capital gains tax cut, 76 percent that will go to people with incomes of \$100,000 or more.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a contract with middle-class America.

#### REPUBLICANS CARE ABOUT CHILDREN

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, we just heard more baloney. The principal tax

cut in the Contract With America is a \$500 per child tax credit. If that is a tax break for the rich, then our friends on the other side of the aisle are sadly misinformed.

They can continue the scare tactics, the distortions, the out-and-out hysteria. It is time we told the truth. Republicans care about children and our numbers prove it.

We are growing School Lunch Programs by 4.5 percent per year for the next 5 years. By the year 2000, we will be spending \$1 billion more on the School-Based Nutrition Program than today.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is clear that Republicans care about children and our numbers prove it. The American public should ask who the Democrats care about when they oppose a 4.5-percent spending increase for school lunches and \$1 billion more by the year 2000.

Do they care about a School Lunch Program that is closer to home? Do they care about our children and their future or do they care about some Federal bureaucrats?

#### THE CONTRACT WITH AMERICA AND THE CONSTITUTION

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have a Contract With America. Unfortunately, they do not seem to care whether it violates this contract with America, the Constitution of the United States.

This contract with America, the Constitution, took another hit last week. They called it tort reform but what they did was federalize all the legal standards, and that, my friends, is contrary to the commerce clause and the 10th amendment to the Constitution.

Let's strike out another provision in the Constitution, punch it out again, punch it out again, my Republican colleagues. Your Constitution is going down the drain. Punch it out again.

#### MARCH MADNESS

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

Mr. HOKE. It is the commerce clause, the commerce clause is the part of the Constitution that gives the mandate to the Congress to do what we did last week.

Mr. Speaker, March madness usually refers to that time of year when all college basketball fans glue themselves to the television and become transformed into screaming, raving hoops fanatics. However, this year March madness has taken on a few new connotations.

March madness could refer to the wild distortions that the bitter defenders of big Government the liberal

Democrats, are spreading about the Republican welfare plan. March madness could refer to the scare tactics and the false hysteria Democrats have ignited among the poor children in America telling them that they will starve under the Republican majority. Finally March madness could refer to the fact that yet another member of President Clinton's Cabinet has become involved in yet another ethics investigation.

Mr. Speaker, what madness is next?

#### CUTTING CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS

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

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, activities occurring in the 104th Congress this week make very clear the warped priorities and bad economics of the Republican's contract on America. The warped priorities are evident in the programs subject to deep and painful spending cuts: school lunches, day-care nutrition, drug-free schools, and several other programs representing an important investment in our next generation. In short, help for our kids that our kids need.

And for what are these cuts being made? Being made to finance a tax package to be voted on in the Committee on Ways and Means, a package that represents the more you make, the more you are going to get. In fact, this tax package makes it clear the breaks are going to be even more lucrative in the future. Consider it the gift that keeps on giving for America's most privileged and powerful.

So there it is. Cuts in programs for our kids to fund tax breaks for the most privileged. The contract for America is bad news for this country because it is bad news for our kids.

#### FCC SPECTRUM AUCTIONS

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

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to today applaud yesterday's spectrum auction conducted by the Federal Communications Commission. The broadband auction for personal communications services resulted in bids of more than \$7 billion, that is 7 with a "B", billion dollars, exceeding all previous estimates.

Pioneer preference licenses to companies using new innovative technologies resulted in bids of over \$700 million. As many as 300,000 new jobs will be created as a result of these auctions.

They have been more than successful than I ever dreamed when I first introduced this concept a few years ago in that auction revenues now will approach an impressive \$9 billion. This is \$9 billion that will go to the Treasury.

Rarely do we see an idea whose time has not only come but has produced the kind of revenue to the taxpayers that this particular provision has.

Our full Committee on Commerce tomorrow will consider legislation to extend the FCC's auction authority by the year 2000. We plan to continue in that vein.

#### REPUBLICANS ARE NOT CUTTING SCHOOL LUNCHES

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I see where several of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle are up to their same old class warfare tricks. The gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority whip, said that Republicans are giving working Americans the cold shoulder. Well, the Democrats' class warfare will not wash with the American people.

Republicans are not out to cut school lunches. Actually our program will increase school lunches to the children of our country. We do not intend to cut the School Lunch Program. Our proposal will actually increase school lunches.

We offer incentives. Our proposals offer better opportunities. The Democrats offer the same old class warfare rhetoric with more taxing and more spending.

I urge the American people to look carefully at what we the Republicans are attempting to do, which is provide more school lunches for our school children.

□ 1430

#### TAKE FROM OUR FAMILIES AND GIVE TO THE BUREAUCRATS

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, we are seeing a new version of Robin Hood displayed by the Democrats this week. They want to "take as much as possible from hard working families and give to the bureaucrats in Washington, DC."

Minority Leader GEPHARDT even called the Republican proposal to give a \$500 per child tax credit to families "an appalling display of Republican indifference to working people." This tax credit will benefit approximately 50 million families—90 percent of whom earn less than \$75,000 a year. Yet the minority party claims this is bad for working families.

Whose family would be worse off today with an additional \$1,000 to help make ends meet? Whose family would be worse off with \$1,000 to start a college education fund for their children?

Whose family would be worse off with more of their own hard-earned money?

Mr. Speaker, it is time we start cutting bureaucracy here in Washington, DC, and returning control and money to American families. Despite what the minority party claims, the \$500 per child tax credit is good for all working families and I urge my colleagues to support it.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today.

#### ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT AMENDMENTS

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 402) to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 402

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

#### SECTION 1. RATIFICATION OF CERTAIN CASWELL AND MONTANA CREEK NATIVE ASSOCIATIONS CONVEYANCES.

The conveyance of approximately 11,520 acres to Montana Creek Native Association, Inc., and the conveyance of approximately 11,520 acres to Caswell Native Association, Inc., by Cook Inlet Region, Inc. in fulfillment of the agreement of February 3, 1976, and subsequent letter agreement of March 26, 1982, among the three parties are hereby adopted and ratified as a matter of Federal law. These conveyances shall be deemed to be conveyances pursuant to section 14(h)(2) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)(2)). The group corporations for Montana Creek and Caswell are hereby declared to have received their full entitlement and shall not be entitled to the receipt of any additional lands under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act. The ratification of these conveyances shall not have any other effect upon section 14(h) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(h)) or upon the duties and obligations of the United States to any Alaska Native Corporation. This ratification shall not be the basis for any claim to land or money by Caswell or Montana Creek group corporations or any other Alaska Native Corporation against the State of Alaska, the United States, or Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated.

#### SEC. 2. MINING CLAIMS AFTER LANDS CONVEYED TO ALASKA REGIONAL CORPORATION.

Section 22(c) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1621(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(3) This section shall apply to lands conveyed by interim conveyance or patent to a regional corporation pursuant to this Act which are made subject to a mining claim or claims located under the general mining laws, including lands conveyed prior to enactment of this paragraph. Effective upon the date of the enactment of this paragraph, the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Land Management and in a manner consistent with section 14(g) of this Act, shall transfer to the regional corporation administration of all mining claims determined to be entirely within lands conveyed to that corporation. Any person holding such mining claim or claims shall meet such requirements of the general mining laws and section 314 of the Federal Land Management and Policy Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1744), except that any filings which would have been made with the Bureau of Land Management if the lands were within Federal ownership shall be timely made to the appropriate regional corporation. The validity of any such mining claim or claims may be contested by the regional corporation, in the place of the United States. All contest proceedings and appeals by the mining claimants of adverse decisions made by the regional corporation shall be brought in Federal District Court for the District of Alaska. Neither the United States nor any Federal agency or official shall be named or joined as a party in such proceedings or appeals. All revenues from such mining claims received after passage of this paragraph shall be remitted to the regional corporation subject to distribution pursuant to section 7(1) of this Act, except that in the event that the mining claim or claims are not totally within the lands conveyed to the regional corporation, the regional corporation shall be entitled only to that proportion of revenues, other than administrative fees, reasonably allocated to the portion of the mining claim or claims so conveyed."

**SEC. 3. SETTLEMENT OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE CONTAMINATION OF TRANSFERRED LANDS.**

The Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**"CLAIMS ARISING FROM CONTAMINATION OF TRANSFERRED LANDS**

**"SEC. 40. (a) As used in this section:**

"(1) The term 'contaminant' means hazardous substances harmful to public health or the environment, including asbestos.

"(2) The term 'lands' means real property transferred to an Alaska Native Corporation pursuant to this Act.

"(b) Within 18 months of enactment of this section, and after consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, State of Alaska, and appropriate Alaska Native corporations and organizations, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, a report addressing issues presented by the presence of hazardous substances on lands conveyed or prioritized for conveyance to such corporations pursuant to this Act. Such report shall consist of—

"(1) existing information concerning the nature and types of contaminants present on such lands prior to conveyance to Alaska Native corporations;

"(2) existing information identifying the existence and availability of potentially responsible parties for the removal or amelioration of the effects of such contaminants;

"(3) identification of existing remedies; and

"(4) recommendations for any additional legislation that the Secretary concludes is

necessary to remedy the problem of contaminants on such lands."

**SEC. 4. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE PURPOSES OF IMPLEMENTING REQUIRED RECONVEYANCES.**

Section 14(c) of Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1613(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary for the purpose of providing technical assistance to Village Corporations established pursuant to this Act in order that they may fulfill the reconveyance requirements of section 14(c) of this Act. The Secretary may make funds available as grants to ANCSA or nonprofit corporations that maintain in-house land planning and management capabilities."

**SEC. 5. NATIVE ALLOTMENTS.**

Section 1431(o) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (94 Stat. 2542) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(5) Following the exercise by Arctic Slope Regional Corporation of its option under paragraph (1) to acquire the subsurface estate beneath lands within the National Petroleum Reserve—Alaska selected by Kuukpik Corporation, where such subsurface estate entirely surrounds lands subject to a Native allotment application approved under section 905 of this Act, and the oil and gas in such lands have been reserved to the United States, Arctic Slope Regional Corporation, at its further option and subject to the concurrence of the Kuukpik Corporation, shall be entitled to receive a conveyance of the reserved oil and gas, including all rights and privileges therein reserved to the United States, in such lands. Upon the receipt of a conveyance of such oil and gas interests, the entitlement of Arctic Slope Regional Corporation to in-lieu subsurface lands under section 12(a)(1) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1611(a)(1)) shall be reduced by the amount of acreage determined by the Secretary to be conveyed to Arctic Slope Regional Corporation pursuant to this paragraph."

**SEC. 6. REPORT CONCERNING OPEN SEASON FOR CERTAIN NATIVE ALASKAN VETERANS FOR ALLOTMENTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—No later than six months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, the State of Alaska and appropriate Native corporations and organizations, shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, a report which shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

(1) The number of Vietnam era veterans, as defined in section 101 of title 38, United States Code, who were eligible for but did not apply for an allotment of not to exceed 160 acres under the Act of May 17, 1906 (Chapter 2469; 34 Stat. 197), as such Act was in effect before December 18, 1971;

(2) an assessment of the potential impacts of additional allotments on conservation system units as such term is defined in section 102(4) of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (94 Stat. 2375); and

(3) recommendations for any additional legislation that the Secretary concludes is necessary.

(b) REQUIREMENT.—The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall release to the Secretary of the Interior information relevant to the report required under subsection (a).

**SEC. 7. TRANSFER OF WRANGELL INSTITUTE.**

(a) PROPERTY TRANSFER.—Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated, is authorized to transfer

to the United States and the General Services Administration shall accept an approximately 10-acre site of the Wrangell Institute in Wrangell, Alaska, and the structures contained thereon.

**(b) RESTORATION OF PROPERTY CREDITS.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—In exchange for the land and structures transferred under subsection (a), property bidding credits in the total amount of \$382,305, shall be restored to the Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated, property account in the Treasury established under section 12(b) of the Act of January 2, 1976 (Public Law 94-204; 43 U.S.C. 1611 note), referred to in such section as the "Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated, property account". Such property bidding credits shall be used in the same fiscal year as received by Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated.

(2) HOLD HARMLESS.—The United States shall defend and hold harmless Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated, and its subsidiaries in any and all claims arising from Federal or Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated, ownership of the land and structures prior to their return to the United States.

**SEC. 8. SHISHMAREF AIRPORT AMENDMENT.**

The Shishmaref Airport, conveyed to the State of Alaska on January 5, 1967, in Patent No. 1240529, is subject to reversion to the United States, pursuant to the terms of that patent for nonuse as an airport. The Secretary is authorized to reacquire the interests originally conveyed pursuant to Patent No. 1240529, and, notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall immediately thereafter transfer all right, title, and interest of the United States in the subject lands to the Shishmaref Native Corporation. Nothing in this section shall relieve the State, the United States, or any other potentially responsible party of liability, if any, under existing law for the clean up of hazardous or solid wastes on the property, nor shall the United States or Shishmaref Native Corporation become liable for the cleanup of the property solely by virtue of acquiring title from the State or from the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDTS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 402. This bill is the result of a 2-year effort of the Alaska Federation of Natives, the State of Alaska, the administration, and my ranking minority member, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. I thank them for their dedication and hard work.

The bill is noncontroversial. Most of the provisions have already passed the House in previous Congresses but were not acted on by the Senate. We hope that the new congressional leadership will improve the track record on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 402 makes several technical changes to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971 [ANCSA] and the Alaska National Interest Land Conservation Act to address some of the unresolved land issues which have arisen since the passage of these acts.

These include specific land conveyances to Native corporations, the clarification of mining authority and administration of mining claims on lands conveyed to Native corporations, a report on hazardous substances on lands conveyed to Native corporations, an authorization of technical assistance to Native villages to help with land reconveyances required under ANCSA, and a report on Vietnam-era veterans who were eligible but did not receive land under the Native Allotment Act of May 17, 1906.

Mr. Speaker, all these provisions are long awaited, but I feel very strongly about section 6 regarding unclaimed land allotments for Native Alaskans serving during the Vietnam war. Many of these Natives were in service overseas and were unable to file for their allotments. I do not believe that they should be penalized for fulfilling their patriotic duty. I hope that with this report, Congress will be able to enact additional legislation on behalf of these Alaska Native veterans.

The version of the bill before the House has a minor change from the version reported from the Resources Committee on February 8. In section 5, we have restored the right of a Native corporation to concur in the selection of oil and gas rights allowed under the act. Our minority has agreed to this small improvement to the bill.

I also want to thank Chairman KASICH and his staff for their thorough review of this bill in a short period of time and their cooperation in scheduling all the bills on today's program.

I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am a bit puzzled by about how long it took the gentleman from Alaska to describe this bill. What is different about this picture?

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, if I may, there is nothing different about this bill at all. We are just bringing it up under suspension today.

Mr. STUDDS. Let me just say that I concur with this legislation which is substantially the same as the legislation we passed in the previous Congress, and it is without controversy. It is even a good thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation. The gentleman from Alaska has long been a good friend of his Alaska Native constituents and this bill continues that tradition.

This legislation was the subject of a hearing, reported by the committee, and passed by the House in the previous Congress. The eight diverse sections in the bill were largely developed in the course of negotiations between the Alaska Federation of Natives, the State of Alaska, and the Department of the Interior. This process was successful in fostering consensus and minimizing controversy.

I would note, Mr. Speaker, that this bill also reflects a tradition of bipartisan concern and cooperation within the committee when dealing with issues affecting Alaska Natives.

I urge support for the legislation.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 402, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PURCHASE OF COMMON STOCK OF COOK INLET REGIONAL CORPORATION

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 421) to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to provide for the purchase of common stock of Cook Inlet Region, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 421

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

#### SECTION 1. PURCHASE OF SETTLEMENT COMMON STOCK OF COOK INLET REGION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(h) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (43 U.S.C. 1606(h)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(4)(A) As used in this paragraph, the term ‘Cook Inlet Regional Corporation’ means Cook Inlet Region, Incorporated.

“(B) The Cook Inlet Regional Corporation may, by an amendment to its articles of incorporation made in accordance with the voting standards under section 36(d)(1), purchase Settlement Common Stock of the Cook Inlet Regional Corporation and all rights associated with the stock from the shareholders of Cook Inlet Regional Corporation in accordance with any provisions included in the amendment that relate to the terms, procedures, number of offers to purchase, and timing of offers to purchase.

“(C) Subject to subparagraph (D), and notwithstanding paragraph (1)(B), the shareholders of Cook Inlet Regional Corporation may, in accordance with an amendment made pursuant to subparagraph (B), sell the Settlement Common Stock of the Cook Inlet Regional Corporation to itself.

“(D) No sale or purchase may be made pursuant to this paragraph without the prior approval of the board of directors of Cook Inlet Regional Corporation. Except as provided in subparagraph (E), each sale and purchase made under this paragraph shall be made pursuant to an offer made on the same terms to all holders of Settlement Common Stock of the Cook Inlet Regional Corporation.

“(E) To recognize the different rights that accrue to any class or series of shares of Settlement Common Stock owned by stockholders who are not residents of a Native village (referred to in this paragraph as ‘non-village shares’), an amendment made pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall authorize the board of directors (at the option of the board) to offer to purchase—

“(1) the non-village shares, including the right to share in distributions made to

shareholders pursuant to subsections (j) and (m) (referred to in this paragraph as ‘non-resident distribution rights’), at a price that includes a premium, in addition to the amount that is offered for the purchase of other village shares of Settlement Common Stock of the Cook Inlet Regional Corporation, that reflects the value of the non-resident distribution rights; or

“(ii) non-village shares without the non-resident distribution rights associated with the shares.

“(F) Any shareholder who accepts an offer made by the board of directors pursuant to subparagraph (E)(i) shall receive, with respect to each non-village share sold by the shareholder to the Cook Inlet Regional Corporation—

“(1) the consideration for a share of Settlement Common Stock offered to shareholders of village shares; and

“(ii) a security for only the nonresident rights that attach to such share that does not have attached voting rights (referred to in this paragraph as a ‘non-voting security’).

“(G) An amendment made pursuant to subparagraph (B) shall authorize the issuance of a non-voting security that—

“(1) shall, for purposes of subsections (j) and (m), be treated as a non-village share with respect to—

“(I) computing distributions under such subsections; and

“(II) entitling the holder of the share to the proportional share of the distributions made under such subsections;

“(ii) may be sold to Cook Inlet Region, Inc.; and

“(iii) shall otherwise be subject to the restrictions under paragraph (1)(B).

“(H) Any shares of Settlement Common Stock purchased pursuant to this paragraph shall be canceled on the conditions that—

“(1) non-village shares with the non-resident rights that attach to such shares that are purchased pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered to be—

“(I) outstanding shares; and

“(II) for the purposes of subsection (m), shares of stock registered on the books of the Cook Inlet Regional Corporation in the names of nonresidents of villages;

“(ii) any amount of funds that would be distributable with respect to non-village shares or non-voting securities pursuant to subsection (j) or (m) shall be distributed by Cook Inlet Regional Corporation to itself; and

“(iii) village shares that are purchased pursuant to this paragraph shall be considered to be—

“(I) outstanding shares, and

“(II) for the purposes of subsection (k) shares of stock registered on the books of the Cook Inlet Regional Corporation in the names of the residents of villages.

“(I) Any offer to purchase Settlement Common Stock made pursuant to this paragraph shall exclude from the offer—

“(1) any share of Settlement Common Stock held, at the time the offer is made, by an officer (including a member of the board of directors) of Cook Inlet Regional Corporation or a member of the immediate family of the officer; and

“(ii) any share of Settlement Common Stock held by any custodian, guardian, trustee, or attorney representing a shareholder of Cook Inlet Regional Corporation in fact or law, or any other similar person, entity, or representative.

“(j)(1) The board of directors of Cook Inlet Regional Corporation, in determining the terms of an offer to purchase made under

this paragraph, including the amount of any premium paid with respect to a non-village share, may rely upon the good faith opinion of a recognized firm of investment bankers or valuation experts.

"(ii) Neither Cook Inlet Regional Corporation nor a member of the board of directors or officers of Cook Inlet Regional Corporation shall be liable for damages resulting from terms made in an offer made in connection with any purchase of Settlement Common Stock if the offer was made—

"(I) in good faith;

"(II) in reliance on a determination made pursuant to clause (i); and

"(III) otherwise in accordance with this paragraph.

"(K) The consideration given for the purchase of Settlement Common Stock made pursuant to an offer to purchase that provides for such consideration may be in the form of cash, securities, or a combination of cash and securities, as determined by the board of directors of Cook Inlet Regional Corporation, in a manner consistent with an amendment made pursuant to subparagraph (B).

"(L) Sale of Settlement Common Stock in accordance with this paragraph shall not diminish a shareholder's status as an Alaska Native or descendant of a Native for the purpose of qualifying for those programs, benefits and services or other rights or privileges set out for the benefit of Alaska Natives and Native Americans. Proceeds from the sale of Settlement Common Stock shall not be excluded in determining eligibility for any needs-based programs that may be provided by Federal, State or local agencies."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 8(c) of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1607(c)) is amended by striking "(h)" and inserting "(h) (other than paragraph (4))".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 421, a bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act [ANCSA]. I introduced this bill at the request of Cook Inlet Region, Inc. [CIRI] and have worked with the Alaska Federation of Natives, the State of Alaska, the Department of the Interior, and my ranking minority member, Mr. MILLER, to reach a consensus.

Cook Inlet Region, Inc., is one of 13 regional corporations formed under ANCSA. CIRI has approximately 6,300 shareholders, who each own 100 shares of stock. ANCSA bans the public sale of any Native corporation stock until the majority of its shareholders vote to remove this restriction.

CIRI's shareholders would like to sell their stock. CIRI wishes to buy back stock from its shareholders and to cancel these shares, thus keeping the corporation in Native ownership. This bill is intended to give CIRI, and only CIRI, this authority.

The Committee on Resources favorably reported H.R. 421 on February 8

with an amendment offered by Mr. MILLER. His amendment protects CIRI, its directors, and officers from liability in connection with an offer to purchase stock if the offer was made in good faith, in reliance on a good faith opinion of a recognized firm of investment bankers or valuation experts, and if the offer was otherwise in accordance with section 7(h)(4) of ANCSA. This will provide reasonable protections for CIRI shareholders while protecting CIRI from repeated litigation when it has made a good faith offer to purchase stock that is based on an independent, professional evaluation.

I accepted Mr. MILLER's amendment because it contained the protection needed by CIRI, and it is consistent with ANCSA, which encourages Alaska's Native people and their corporations to conduct their affairs in their own way and without litigation. The protections provided under H.R. 421 are limited to stock re-purchase offerings only, as long as they are made in accordance with ANCSA, and this provision does not apply to other types of corporate activities under State or Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed the House last Congress, and I urge support again for this measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just observe we used to do these things a lot more expeditiously in the old days. The gentleman is filibustering in his vintage years.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely correct. This bill is absolutely without controversy and supported by the administration, and as far as I know, by everyone in Alaska. We did it before, and we should do it again.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. H.R. 421 is virtually identical to a bill introduced by Chairman YOUNG and passed by the House last Congress.

Since the option to purchase stock is subject to approval of the Native shareholders and is expressly limited to Cook Inlet Region, Inc. This bill is not controversial. The administration has no objection. In an effort to assure that the interests of the Native shareholders are protected, the committee adopted an amendment offered by Representative GEORGE MILLER which deleted immunity from liability for financial advisors involved in establishing the value of the stock.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman from Alaska for his legislation and ask that Members support the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the

rules and pass the bill, H.R. 421, as amended.

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

#### SEA OF OKHOTSK FISHERIES ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1995

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 715) to amend the Central Bering Sea Fisheries Enforcement Act of 1992 to prohibit fishing in the Central Sea of Okhotsk by vessels and nationals of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 715

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This act may be cited as the "Sea of Okhotsk Fisheries Enforcement Act of 1995".

#### SEC. 2. FISHING PROHIBITION.

The Central Bering Sea Fisheries Enforcement Act of 1992 (16 U.S.C. 1823 note) is amended—

(1) in section 302, by inserting "and the Central Sea of Okhotsk" after "Central Bering Sea"; and

(2) in section 306—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (2), (3), (4), (5), and (6) in order as paragraphs (3), (4), (5), (6), and (7); and

(B) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) CENTRAL SEA OF OKHOTSK.—The term 'Central Sea of Okhotsk' means the central Sea of Okhotsk area which is more than two hundred nautical miles seaward of the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the Russian Federation is measured."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

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

Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 715, I urge my colleagues to join me in this effort to help save valuable living marine resources in a small enclave of international waters known as the Peanut Hole.

Three years ago, Congress approved my Central Bering Sea Fisheries Enforcement Act, which prohibited the destruction of pollock stocks in an area known as the Donut Hole.

While this law has promoted conservation efforts for the region, it has had unwanted results. Certain fishermen from China, Japan, Korea, and Poland have now moved their operations to the Peanut Hole and they are severely overfishing the pollock stocks in this region. Unless immediate steps are taken, these stocks will collapse.

My bill, which has been cosponsored by the leadership of the Subcommittee

on Fisheries, Wildlife and Oceans, JIM SAXTON and GERRY STUDDS, would amend the 1992 statute to prohibit U.S. citizens from fishing in the Peanut Hole unless the fishing operation fully complies with international fishing agreements between the United States and Russia.

The bill is noncontroversial and well supported. It passed the House twice in the last Congress and it is helpful to our negotiators in their ongoing efforts to establish agreements to conserve fish stocks in international waters.

May I suggest at this time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS], it is amazing what you learn when you go to a new committee, such as the Committee on Natural Resources. The gentleman just had the opportunity not only to support this legislation that he worked so hard on last year, but to become an expert in the American Native movement, and I hope and I wish him well.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I would also be very, very excited at the possibility of learning how to pronounce this particular sea.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts if he can also improve my pronouncement.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I could not possibly. I was asking the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I would say it is Okhotsk. I hope that satisfies the gentleman. I would spell it O-k-h-o-t-s-k.

Mr. STUDDS. I congratulate the gentleman.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 715, the Sea of Okhotsk Fisheries Enforcement Act.

The decline of fisheries worldwide, and the need for multilateral cooperation in fisheries management, have become increasingly evident as of late. A recent U.N. Food and Agriculture Organization report classified almost every commercial fish species in every ocean and sea as either "depleted," "fully exploited," or "over-exploited." Stocks in 4 of the world's 17 major fishing regions are seriously depleted, while catches in 9 other regions are declining. If this tide is to be turned, the United States and all coastal nations have a responsibility to participate in international agreements and organizations that provide responsible conservation and management of high seas resources.

This bill demonstrates the U.S. commitment to cooperative management of shared resources on the high seas.

The Sea of Okhotsk, also known as the Peanut Hole, is an area of international waters completely surrounded by the Exclusive Economic Zone [EEZ] of the Russian Federation. Russian resources that migrate into the Peanut Hole are being adversely affected by heavy foreign fishing in that area. Recent efforts by the United States and Russia to forge a management agreement for the Peanut Hole have been thwarted by the lack of cooperation from other countries currently fishing in the area.

This bill would prohibit U.S. fishing in the Peanut Hole until a cooperative international agreement has been reached among the nations that fish there. It would also prohibit entry into U.S. waters to any vessel fishing in the Peanut Hole while no cooperative management agreement exists and to any vessel that violates the agreement once it has been negotiated.

By requiring the United States to work cooperatively in an area of the ocean where fisheries of importance to our own fishermen occur, H.R. 715 signals the U.S. dedication to multilateral management of high seas resources. It is also an important step in our efforts to restore global fisheries, and I am delighted to join the gentleman from Alaska in this effort. I urge Members' support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that the gentleman from Massachusetts brings up a very good point. Our seas are in serious trouble, primarily because of indiscriminate overfishing. This is just a small step forward, but we are going to address this hopefully on another level very soon in the Magnuson Act with an attempt to again arrest some of the misuse of our seas as far as fishing efforts.

I am one who believes very strongly that there are enough fish if we take care of them, if we scientifically put them on a biological survival rate that we can continue to fish. But if we do not do something with the activities from all of the countries jointly we will be destroying that capability to provide the fish to all of the people of this world.

So I again welcome my good friend, the gentleman from Massachusetts, GARY STUDDS, to the Committee on Natural Resources, because there is no one who has worked harder over the years to provide and protect the fishing industry for the continued yield of the species which we depend on than the gentleman from Massachusetts. So we will be looking forward to looking with him hopefully sometime in May, bringing to this floor a bill that will address the domestic side of this issue as well as the international side of this issue.

For those who may not be aware of this, to me the sea has to be recognized as a provider, and it is our responsibility not only to protect but to conserve and to continue providing of the fisheries, as I have said before, that we depend so heavily upon.

So again I welcome the gentleman from Massachusetts to the committee.

□ 1445

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

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

I thank the gentleman for his kind remarks. This is the most wonderfully nonpartisan of all matters. I never met a fish who gave a whit about the gentleman's political affiliation or mine, and we have responsibilities here that dramatically and significantly transcend some of the partisan differences that are occasionally reflected on this floor.

I am authorized by the good people of Cape Cod to extend another invitation to the gentleman, notwithstanding all the partisan things that have occurred here, notwithstanding some of his other contractual obligations, to say to him that he is still welcome on Cape Cod and to see if we can lure him again this year. We look forward to that.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. If the gentleman will yield, I accept that invitation as well as you have been so generously accepting my invitation to travel to the great State of Alaska and participate in the cuisine as provided by our great blue waters. If I go to Cape Cod, I hope I have the added attraction of having that which can be provided by your ocean to my palate regardless of what contract I will be working under for the last hundred days.

Mr. STUDDS. That is a deal, as they say. The gentleman will simply have to adjust himself to beauty of another scale.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 715.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### DESIGNATING THE GREAT WESTERN SCENIC TRAIL AS A STUDY TRAIL

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 531) to designate the Great Western Scenic Trail as a study trail under the National Trails System Act, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 531

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

**SECTION 1. POTENTIAL ADDITION OF GREAT WESTERN SCENIC TRAIL TO NATIONAL TRAIL SYSTEM GREAT WESTERN TRAIL.**

Section 5(c) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(c)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(38) The Great Western Scenic Trail, a system of trails to accommodate a variety of travel users in a corridor of approximately 3,100 miles in length extending from the Arizona-Mexico border to the Idaho-Montana-Canada border, following the approximate route depicted on the map identified as 'Great Western Trail Corridor, 1988', which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture. The trail study shall be conducted by the Secretary of Agriculture, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, in accordance with subsection (b) and shall include—

"(A) the current status of land ownership and current and potential use along the designated route;

"(B) the estimated cost of acquisition of lands or interests in lands, if any; and

"(C) an examination of the appropriateness of motorized trail use along the trail."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 531 is a non-controversial measure that would simply study the prospect of adding the Great Western Trail to the National Trails System. The Great Western Trail extends from Mexico to Canada through the Rocky Mountain West and will take advantage of existing roads, trails, and corridors that enjoy nearly all types of recreational travel. The Great Western Trail is envisioned as truly a western trail. This corridor celebrates the heritage and spirit of the West and the many types of recreational travel people enjoy. Whether you prefer horseback, backpack, canoe, mountain bike, or four-wheel drive, the Great Western Trail will provide you access to the most scenic areas of the West.

There was much discussion in our subcommittee hearing regarding possible conflicts with private property. This is exactly what this trail study is designed to accomplish. H.R. 531, with the amendment I offered in subcommittee, will specifically look at the current status of landownership and the estimated cost of any acquisition if necessary. We cannot know what those impacts will be until this study is completed. I can assure the Members that private property rights are of a highest concern to me and this study will simply let Congress know what the potential impacts will be, giving us suffi-

cient information to decide at a later time whether or not to actually designate this trail.

The amendment to H.R. 531 adopted in subcommittee would delete the language regarding the inventory of rights-of-way along the corridor and would replace that language with the protections called for in the National Trails System Act. The amendment also retains the requirement that the Secretary look at the appropriateness of motorized trail use. I believe this amendment will ensure that the Secretary include in the study a complete look at possible private property conflicts prior to actual congressional designation of the trail. I urge the Members to support H.R. 531.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 531, as amended, is a good bill which will provide for a study of the proposed Great Western Trail for possible designation as a national trail. While the bill only provides for a study, the subcommittee hearing on H.R. 531 entailed a considerable discussion about the possible impacts a trail could have on private property. Having authored national trail legislation myself, I have always found such trails to be highly popular with the public, with good relations among the affected interests and property owners. In any event, this bill just provides for a study, so that if any problems do exist they can be identified and perhaps addressed during the study process.

H.R. 531 was amended by the Resources Committee to substantively modify the bill language regarding the detailed identification of rights-of-way and private property along the proposed trail. This was an improvement over the bill, as introduced. I was concerned, as was the administration, about the original bill language's potential cost and workability. The committee amendment reintegrates the provisions of the National Trails System Act on these matters. I believe such language addresses any concerns. Therefore I support the bill as amended and recommend its adoption by the House.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 531, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

**MINOR BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PARK AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1995**

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 694) entitled the "Minor Boundary Adjustments and Miscellaneous Park Amendments Act of 1995," as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 694

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Minor Boundary Adjustments and Miscellaneous Park Amendments Act of 1995".

**TITLE I—MINOR BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS**

**SEC. 101. YUCCA HOUSE NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundaries of Yucca House National Monument are revised to include the approximately 24.27 acres of land generally depicted on the map entitled "Boundary—Yucca House National Monument, Colorado", numbered 318/80,001-B, and dated February 1990.

(b) MAP.—The map referred to in subsection (a) shall be on file and available for public inspection in appropriate offices of the National Park Service of the Department of the Interior.

**(c) ACQUISITION BY DONATION.—**

(1) IN GENERAL.—Within the boundaries described in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior may acquire lands and interests in lands by donation.

(2) ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS.—The Secretary of the Interior may pay administrative costs arising out of any donation described in paragraph (1) with appropriated funds.

**SEC. 102. ZION NATIONAL PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**

(a) ACQUISITION AND BOUNDARY CHANGE.—The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire by exchange approximately 5.48 acres, in Washington County, Utah, that are located in the SW¼ of Section 28, Township 41 South, Range 10 West, Salt Lake Base and Meridian. In exchange therefor the Secretary is authorized to convey all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to approximately 5.51 acres, in Washington County, Utah, that are located in Lot 2 of Section 5, Township 41 South, Range 11 West. Upon completion of the exchange, the Secretary is authorized to revise the boundary of Zion National Park to add to the park the approximately 5.48 acres acquired by the Secretary under this subsection and to delete from the park the approximately 5.51 acres conveyed by the Secretary under this subsection. Land added to the park under this subsection shall be administered as part of the park in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable thereto.

(b) EXPIRATION.—The authority granted by this section shall expire upon the expiration of the two-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

**SEC. 103. PICTURED ROCKS NATIONAL LAKE-SHORE BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**

The boundary of Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore is hereby modified as depicted on the

map entitled "Area Proposed for Addition to Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore," numbered 625-80, 043A, and dated July 1992.

**SEC. 104. INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**

The administrative boundary between Independence National Historical Park and the United States Customs House along the Moravian Street Walkway in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, is hereby modified as generally depicted on the drawing entitled "Exhibit 1, Independence National Historical Park, Boundary Adjustment", and dated May 1987, which shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept and transfer jurisdiction over property in accordance with such administrative boundary, as modified by this section.

**SEC. 105. CRATERS OF THE MOON NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**

(a) **BOUNDARY REVISION.**—The boundary of the Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho, is revised to add approximately 210 acres and to delete approximately 315 acres as generally depicted on the map entitled "Craters of the Moon National Monument, Idaho, Proposed 1987 Boundary Adjustment", numbered 131-80,008, and dated October 1987. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.

(b) **ADMINISTRATION AND ACQUISITION.**—Federal lands, waters, and interests therein deleted from the boundary of the Craters of the Moon National Monument by this section shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior through the Bureau of Land Management in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.). Federal lands, waters, and interests therein added to the national monument by this section shall be administered by the Secretary as part of the national monument, subject to the laws and regulations applicable thereto. The Secretary is authorized to acquire private lands, waters, and interests therein within the boundary of the national monument by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange, and shall administer such acquired lands, waters, and interests therein as part of the national monument, subject to the laws and regulations applicable thereto.

**SEC. 106. HAGERMAN FOSSIL BEDS NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**

Section 302 of the Arizona-Idaho Conservation Act of 1988 (102 Stat. 4576) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) To further the purposes of the monument, the Secretary is authorized to acquire by donation or, from willing sellers only, by purchase with donated or appropriated funds or by exchange not more than 65 acres outside the boundary depicted on the map referred to in section 301 and to develop and operate, on such acres, research, information, interpretive, and administrative facilities. Lands acquired and facilities developed under this subsection shall be administered by the Secretary as part of the monument. The boundary of the monument shall be modified to include the lands added under this subsection as a noncontiguous parcel."

**SEC. 107. WUPATKI NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.**

The boundary of the Wupatki National Monument, Arizona, is hereby revised to include the lands and interests in lands within the area generally depicted as "Proposed Addition 168.89 Acres" on the map entitled "Boundary—Wupatki and Sunset Crater National Monu-

ments, Arizona", numbered 322-80,021, and dated April 1989. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. Subject to valid existing rights, Federal lands and interests therein within the area added to the monument by this section are hereby transferred without monetary consideration or reimbursement to the administrative jurisdiction of the National Park Service and shall be administered as part of the monument in accordance with the laws and regulations applicable thereto.

**TITLE II—MISCELLANEOUS SPECIFIC PARK AMENDMENTS**

**SEC. 201. ADVISORY COMMISSION FOR KALOKOHONOKOHAU NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK.**

Section 505(f)(7) of the National Parks and Recreation Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 396d(f)(7)), is amended by striking "ten years" and inserting "twenty-five years".

**SEC. 202. FORT PULASKI NATIONAL MONUMENT, GA.**

Section 4 of the Act of June 26, 1936 (ch. 844; 49 Stat. 1979), is amended by striking "Provided, That" and all that follows and inserting a period.

**SEC. 203. AMENDMENT OF BOSTON NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK ACT.**

Section 3(b) of the Boston National Historical Park Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 4102-1(b)) is amended by inserting "(1)" after "(b)" and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to enter into a cooperative agreement with the Boston Public Library to provide for the distribution of informational and interpretive materials relating to the Boston National Historical Park and to the Freedom Trail."

**TITLE III—GENERAL AUTHORIZATIONS AND REPEALERS**

**SEC. 301. REPEAL OF LIMITATION ON PARK BUILDINGS.**

The 10th undesignated paragraph (relating to a limitation on the expenditure of funds for park buildings) under the heading "MISCELLANEOUS OBJECTS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR", under the heading "UNDER THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR", in the first section of the Act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat. 460; 16 U.S.C. 451), is hereby repealed.

**SEC. 302. APPROPRIATIONS FOR TRANSPORTATION OF CHILDREN.**

The first section of the Act of August 7, 1946 (16 U.S.C. 17-2), is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) Provision of transportation for children in nearby communities to and from any unit of the National Park System used in connection with organized recreation and interpretive programs of the National Park Service."

**SEC. 303. FERAL BURROS AND HORSES.**

Section 9 of the Act of December 15, 1971 (16 U.S.C. 1338a), is amended by adding at the end the following: "No provision of this Act shall be construed to limit the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to manage units of the National Park System. No provision of this Act shall be construed to diminish the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to use motor vehicles, fixed-wing aircraft, or helicopters, or to contract for such use, in furtherance of the management of the National Park System, and section 47(a) of title 18, United States Code, shall not apply to such use, or the contracting for such use, by the Secretary of the Interior in furtherance of such management."

**SEC. 304. AUTHORITIES OF THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR RELATING TO MUSEUMS.**

(a) **FUNCTIONS.**—The Act entitled "An Act to increase the public benefits from the National

Park System by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1955 (16 U.S.C. 18f), is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) of the first section, by striking "from such donations and bequests of money"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new section:

**"SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL FUNCTIONS.**

"(a) **TRANSFER, CONVEYANCE, AND DESTRUCTION.**—In addition to the functions specified in the first section of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may perform the following functions in such manner as he shall consider to be in the public interest:

"(1) Transfer museum objects and museum collections that the Secretary determines are no longer needed for museum purposes to qualified Federal agencies that have programs to preserve and interpret cultural or natural heritage, and accept the transfer of museum objects and museum collections for the purposes of this Act from any other Federal agency, without reimbursement. The head of any other Federal agency may transfer, without reimbursement, museum objects and museum collections directly to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for the purposes of this Act.

"(2) Convey museum objects and museum collections that the Secretary determines are no longer needed for museum purposes, without monetary consideration but subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary deems necessary, to private institutions exempt from Federal taxation under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (26 U.S.C. 501(c)(3)) and to non-Federal governmental entities if the Secretary determines, prior to any conveyance under this subsection, that the private or non-Federal recipient is dedicated to the preservation and interpretation of natural or cultural heritage and is qualified to manage the objects or collections, as the case may be.

"(3) Destroy or cause to be destroyed museum objects and museum collections that the Secretary determines to have no scientific, cultural, historic, educational, esthetic, or monetary value.

"(b) **CARE, DELIBERATION, AND REVIEW.**—The Secretary shall ensure that museum objects and museum collections are treated in a careful and deliberate manner that protects the public interest. Prior to taking any action under subsection (a), the Secretary shall establish a systematic review and approval process, including consultation with appropriate experts, that meets the highest standards of the museum profession and applies to all actions taken under this section."

(b) **APPLICATION AND DEFINITIONS.**—The Act entitled "An Act to increase the public benefits from the National Park System by facilitating the management of museum properties relating thereto, and for other purposes", approved July 1, 1955 (16 U.S.C. 18f), as amended by subsection (a), is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**"SEC. 3. APPLICATION AND DEFINITIONS.**

"(a) **APPLICATION.**—Authorities granted to the Secretary of the Interior by this Act shall be available to the Secretary only with regard to—

"(1) museum objects and museum collections that were under the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary for purposes of the National Park System on the day before the date of the enactment of this section; and

"(2) museum objects and museum collections that the Secretary acquires on or after such date.

"(b) **DEFINITIONS.**—For the purposes of this Act, the terms 'museum objects' and 'museum collections' mean objects that are eligible to be or are made part of a museum, library, or archive collection through a formal procedure,

such as accessioning. Such objects are usually movable and include but are not limited to prehistoric and historic artifacts, works of art, books, documents, photographs, and natural history specimens."

**SEC. 305. VOLUNTEERS IN THE PARKS INCREASE.**

Section 4 of the Volunteers in the Parks Act of 1969 (16 U.S.C. 18j) is amended by striking all that follows "Act" and inserting a period.

**SEC. 306. COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS FOR RESEARCH PURPOSES.**

Section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to improve the administration of the national park system by the Secretary of the Interior, and to clarify the authorities applicable to the system, and for other purposes", approved August 18, 1969 (16 U.S.C. 1a-2), is amended—

(1) in subsection (i), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(j) enter into cooperative agreements with public or private educational institutions, States, and their political subdivisions, for the purpose of developing adequate, coordinated, cooperative research and training programs concerning the resources of the National Park System, and, pursuant to any such agreement, to accept from and make available to the cooperator the technical and support staff, financial assistance, supplies and equipment, facilities, and administrative services, relating to cooperative research units, that the Secretary determines to be appropriate; except that no provision of this subsection shall be construed to waive any requirement with respect to research projects that are subject to the Federal procurement regulations."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 694, legislation to make minor boundary adjustments at several national parks and to make other technical amendments to various legislative acts affecting administration of the National Park System.

Title I of the bill contains minor boundary adjustments at seven parks: Zion National Park in Utah, Yucca House National Monument, Pictured Rocks National Lakeshore, Independence National Historical Park, Craters of the Moon National Monument, Hagerman Fossil Beds National Monument, and Wupatki National Monument.

Title II contains several park specific measures and Title III of the bill makes several changes in the generic authority of the Park Service, such as increasing the amount that NPS can spend on an annual basis for their volunteer program.

This is a good bill which has been developed in a bipartisan fashion with the administration. A similar bill has passed the House in each of the last two sessions and I hope that it will finally be enacted this Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 694 is a noncontroversial housekeeping bill that makes minor boundary adjustments and other miscellaneous changes in programs and authorities of the National Park Service.

The bill, as reported by the Resources Committee, contains an amendment that reflects appropriate changes to this noncontroversial bill and will make the amended bill consistent with previous action on this and related measures in the last Congress. The deletion of the proposed extension of the Advisory Commission at Women's Rights National Historical Park mirrors the action the Resources Committee took on a measure—H.R. 359—dealing with the Women's Rights Park in the 103d Congress. Likewise, the amendment corrects a mistake in the introduced bill dealing with museum properties. The amended bill language will now accurately reflect the agreement worked out in the last Congress with the former Government Operations Committee and which also passed the House. The last change made by the amendment was technical to make sure that the bill did not inadvertently undercut competitive bidding of research projects.

These are all good changes that improved the bill. I support HR 694, as amended, and recommend its adoption by the House.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 694, as amended.

The question was taken. Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

**WALNUT CANYON NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT OF 1995**

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 562) to modify the boundaries of Walnut Canyon National Monument in the State of Arizona, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 562

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

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Walnut Canyon National Monument Boundary Modification Act of 1995".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that:

(1) Walnut Canyon National Monument was established for the preservation and interpretation of certain settlements and land use patterns associated with the prehistoric Sinaguan culture of northern Arizona.

(2) Major cultural resources associated with the purposes of Walnut Canyon National Monument are near the boundary and are currently managed under multiple-use objectives of the adjacent national forest. These concentrations of cultural resources, often referred to as "forts", would be more effectively managed as part of the National Park System.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to modify the boundaries of the Walnut Canyon National Monument (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "national monument") to improve management of the national monument and associated resources.

**SEC. 3. BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.**

Effective on the date of enactment of this Act, the boundaries of the national monument shall be modified as depicted on the map entitled "Boundary Proposal—Walnut Canyon National Monument, Coconino County, Arizona", numbered 360/80,010, and dated September 1994. Such map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Director of the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture, is authorized to make technical and clerical corrections to such map.

**SEC. 4. ACQUISITION AND TRANSFER OF PROPERTY.**

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands and interest in lands within the national monument, by donation, purchase with donated or appropriated funds, or exchange. Federal property within the boundaries of the national monument (as modified by this Act) is hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior for management as part of the national monument. Federal property excluded from the monument pursuant to the boundary modification under section 3 is hereby transferred to the administrative jurisdiction of the Secretary of Agriculture to be managed as a part of the Coconino National Forest.

**SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.**

The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall manage the national monument in accordance with this Act and the provisions of law generally applicable to units of the National Park Service, including "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes" approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1, 2-4).

**SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 562, a bill to modify the boundary at Walnut Canyon National Monument in Arizona.

The purpose of this legislation is to allow consistent management of the archeological resources in Walnut Canyon.

Walnut Canyon National Monument was established in 1915 to serve and protect the ruins of prehistoric Sinaguan settlements.

Within the canyon there are five steep, rocky ridges that extend into the canyon from the rims. Archeological sites cluster around these dramatic features, which were called forts by early archeologists.

My legislation would extend the boundary of the monument to include an additional two forts and associated archeological areas by transferring approximately 1,279 acres currently managed by the U.S. Forest Service to the Walnut Canyon National Monument managed by the Park Service.

During consideration at the Resources Committee, an en bloc amendment to H.R. 562 was adopted.

This amendment changed the map reference used in this legislation to include 53 acres of land owned by a private property owner adjacent to the current Monument boundary.

The landowner in question has asked that this land be included and has indicated his desire to work with the Park Service to bring about a land exchange.

The amendment also inserts an authorization for appropriations into the bill. I believe that this language provides an important safeguard for the private landowner should his efforts at exchange fail.

Mr. Speaker, my legislation enjoys the strong support of the Flagstaff City Council and the Coconino County Board of Supervisors.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the administration has no objection to this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank the chairman of the Resources Committee and the chairman and ranking member of the National Parks, Forests, and Lands Subcommittee for their assistance in moving this important bill.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 562.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first to my colleague from Arizona, congratulations; I assume this is the first bill he has managed.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 562, as introduced, would have modified the boundaries of the Walnut Canyon National Monument to provide for the inclusion of approximately 1,239 acres to be administratively transferred to the National

Park Service from the Forest Service and the deletion of 54 acres which would be administratively transferred to the Forest Service from the National Park Service.

□ 1500

The bill was subsequently amended by the Resources Committee to also include within the monument boundaries 53 acres of private property. Mr. Speaker, we support the bill, and, as I noted at committee markup, I find it ironic that when Representative Karan English introduced this legislation last year, it included a private property owner. Subsequently, that owner decided, that after supporting being in the bill, he no longer wanted to be included. Representative English asked that his property be deleted and the committee and the House passed the bill in the 103d Congress without this property. That same private landowner now again wants his property included in the bill and the committee amendment accomplishes this.

My good friend, the gentleman from Arizona, assured me this is the last time we will deal with this issue. I supported this amendment in committee because the resource values of that private property would be an excellent addition to the monument. I just hope this landowner does not again change his mind.

With that being said, Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 562, as amended, and recommend its approval by the House.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I certainly welcome the support of the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON], my good friend, and once again, as we did in committee, let me allay the fears of my good friend from New Mexico because the landowner now in question has decided that we are married, and we are going to stay married with this provision.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. HAYWORTH] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 562, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### COMMERCIAL VEHICLES IN THE DELAWARE WATER GAP NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 536) to extend indefinitely the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to collect a commercial operation fee in the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 536

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

#### SECTION 1. PROHIBITION OF COMMERCIAL VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Effective at noon on September 30, 2005, the use of Highway 209 within Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area by commercial vehicles, when such use is not connected with the operation of the recreation area, is prohibited, except as provided in subsection (b).

(b) LOCAL BUSINESS USE PROTECTED.—Subsection (a) does not apply with respect to the use of commercial vehicles to serve businesses located within or in the vicinity of the recreation area, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) CONFORMING PROVISIONS.—(1) Paragraphs (1) through (3) of the third undesignated paragraph under the heading "ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS" in chapter VII of title I of Public Law 98-63 (97 Stat. 329) are repealed, effective September 30, 2005.

(2) Prior to noon on September 30, 2005, the Secretary shall collect and utilize a commercial use fee from commercial vehicles in accordance with paragraphs (1) through (3) of such third undesignated paragraph. Such fee shall not exceed \$25 per trip.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 536, legislation to reinstate the commercial vehicle use fee at Delaware Water Gap National Recreation in Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, this bill simply reinstates the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to collect a fee for nonlocal commercial vehicles which use Route 209 through Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. That authority, which expired in 1993, is important for the management of commercial vehicular traffic, as well as ensuring the safety of park visitors and local residents who use this road.

The bill provides for this unique authority to expire in 10 years, when alternative routes are expected to be available for this commercial traffic.

I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] for his work on this bill and urge all my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 536, as introduced, was a significant departure from the legislation—Section 301 of H.R. 3252—which passed the House last Congress. The bill that passed the House last Congress provided for an end by the year 2000 of through commercial truck traffic on Route 209 within the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area. The bill, as introduced, would have extended that authority indefinitely. I believe it is in the public interest to end through truck traffic on Route 209 within the park. That's why I prefer the House language from last year. However, I recognize that the National Park Service in their testimony before the Resources Committee asked for additional time, until the year 2005, to end through truck traffic. I supported the committee amendment that embodies this change with the understanding that this so-called temporary authority will be just that—temporary—and that through truck traffic on this segment of Route 209 will end in 2005.

Mr. Speaker, with that change to the bill, I support H.R. 536, as amended, and recommend its adoption by the House.

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

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman DON YOUNG and Subcommittee Chairman JIM HANSEN and BILL RICHARDSON for their cooperation and support in fashioning this legislation. Over the last two sessions of Congress there has been strong bipartisan support for this bill. During the 103d Congress, Subcommittee Chairman VENTO helped to facilitate House passage of a bill similar to H.R. 536, but the Senate was unable to act on that measure prior to the close of the session.

I introduced this measure so that Congress can extend the management policy which has helped to save lives, maintained the economic viability of regional businesses and enhanced the quality of life in Monroe and Pike Counties, PA. The Office of Management and Budget and the National Park Service has advised me that there is no objection to the enactment of this bill. The fiscal impact of H.R. 536 would be negligible because the new fees authorized by this measure would offset the cost of collecting the fees.

The creation of the Delaware Water Gap National Recreation Area, in 1965, from an existing rural residential locality, with accompanying business community, presented many unique policy challenges to the Park Service. The test for the Park Service was how to manage the heavy truck traffic which was traveling through the center of the recreation area on Route 209, at a rate of 3,000 trucks a day, without adversely impacting local business needs.

Route 209 was a primary route for commercial truck traffic which was destined for points in New England. This heavy use of Route 209, which was incompatible with its original design

as a small rural road, created problems varying from accident related deaths, road and property damage, to the creation of unacceptable levels of noise and air pollution.

Clearly, the existence of a heavily traveled commercial route cutting through the recreation area was inconsistent with the purpose for which the park was created. For this reason, Route 209 was transferred to the Park Service from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania so that a partial ban could be implemented on truck traffic not serving local businesses.

In July 1983, Public Law 98-63 authorized the closure of Route 209 to commercial truck traffic except vehicles serving the park or regional businesses and established the existing fee schedule. The NPS implemented the law by setting up checkpoints and toll booths to collect fees from commercial traffic. The authority to collect fees was to expire in 10 years or when Interstate 287 was completed as an alternate route. This carefully crafted compromise effectively balanced the needs of the local business community with the mission of the national recreational area.

The execution of this ban and the free collection policy have been highly successful in reducing highway deaths and injuries, air and noise pollution and property damage. This has been accomplished while protecting local business needs. To date, businesses along Route 209 or contiguous to the recreation area have been able to effectively co-exist with the park under this management policy. The Park Service, in conjunction with the Delaware Water Gap Citizens Advisory Committee, support the provisions in H.R. 536 and the extension of the fee collection authority.

As a management policy tool, the ban and fee collection schedule have been effective in achieving the goals for which they were designed 10 years ago. Even though the revenues which have been generated by the fee collection operation are decreasing over time, the process raises adequate moneys to subsidize the collection operation. Historically, any profits from the commercial fees are additionally applied to the maintenance of Route 209.

Over time the collection process may have to be phased out due to dwindling revenues collected from the operation. It is anticipated that the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania will be able to improve State Route 2001, the major western north/south route paralleling Route 209, to an adequate level to accommodate the traffic from Route 209 if it must be closed to commercial traffic. The State envisions that it will take 10 years to upgrade State Route 2001. Therefore, I strongly recommend that, at this juncture, the Park minimally continue the current fee collection operation for another 10 years. For the immediate future, I believe that the collection of fees should be continued as an important management tool for the Park Service in order to allow local businesses to use Route 209 while raising revenues for its maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request the expeditious approval of this measure due to the July 30, 1993, expiration date of the current law.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 536, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

CHACOAN OUTLIERS PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 517) to amend title V of Public Law 96-550, designating the Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites, and for other purposes.

H.R. 517

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Chacoan Outliers Protection Act of 1995".

SEC. 2. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 501(b) of Public Law 96-550 (16 U.S.C. 4101i(b)) is amended by striking "San Juan Basin;" and inserting in lieu thereof, "San Juan Basin and surrounding areas;"

SEC. 3. ADDITIONS TO CHACO CULTURE ARCHEOLOGICAL PROTECTION SITES.

Subsection 502(b) of Public Law 96-550 (16 U.S.C. 4101i-1(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b)(1) Thirty-nine outlying sites as generally depicted on a map entitled 'Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites', numbered 310/80,033-B and dated September 1991, are hereby designated as 'Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites'. The thirty-nine archeological protection sites totaling approximately 14,372 acres identified as follows:

"Name:

|                              | Acres |
|------------------------------|-------|
| Allentown .....              | 380   |
| Andrews Ranch .....          | 950   |
| Bee Burrow .....             | 480   |
| Bisa'anli .....              | 131   |
| Casa del Rio .....           | 40    |
| Casamero .....               | 160   |
| Chimney Rock .....           | 3,160 |
| Coolidge .....               | 450   |
| Dalton Pass .....            | 135   |
| Dittert .....                | 480   |
| Great Bend .....             | 26    |
| Greenlee Ruin .....          | 60    |
| Grey Hill Spring .....       | 23    |
| Guadalupe .....              | 115   |
| Halfway House .....          | 40    |
| Haystack .....               | 565   |
| Hogback .....                | 453   |
| Indian Creek .....           | 100   |
| Jaquez .....                 | 66    |
| Kin Nizhoni .....            | 726   |
| Lake Valley .....            | 30    |
| Manuelito-Atsee Nitsaa ..... | 60    |
| Manuelito-Kin Hochol .....   | 116   |
| Morris 41 .....              | 85    |
| Muddy Water .....            | 1,090 |
| Navajo Springs .....         | 260   |
| Newcomb .....                | 50    |
| Peach Springs .....          | 1,046 |
| Pierre's Site .....          | 440   |

|                                 | Acres |
|---------------------------------|-------|
| Raton Well .....                | 23    |
| Salmon Ruin .....               | 5     |
| San Mateo .....                 | 61    |
| Sanostee .....                  | 1,565 |
| Section 8 .....                 | 10    |
| Skunk Springs/Crumbled House .. | 533   |
| Standing Rock .....             | 348   |
| Toh-la-kai .....                | 10    |
| Twin Angeles .....              | 40    |
| Upper Kin Klizhin .....         | 60.   |

"(2) The map referred to in paragraph (1) shall be kept on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service, the office of the State Director of the Bureau of Land Management located in Santa Fe, New Mexico, the office of the Area Director of the Bureau of Indian Affairs located in Window Rock, Arizona, and the offices of the Arizona and New Mexico State Historic Preservation Officers."

#### SEC. 4. ACQUISITIONS.

Section 504(c)(2) of Public Law 96-550 (16 U.S.C. 4101i-3(c)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The Secretary shall seek to use a combination of land acquisition authority under this section and cooperative agreements (pursuant to section 505) to accomplish the purposes of archeological resource protection at those sites described in section 502(b) that remain in private ownership."

#### SEC. 5. ASSISTANCE TO THE NAVAJO NATION.

Section 506 of Public Law 96-550 (16 U.S.C. 4101i-5) is amended by adding the following new subsection at the end thereof:

"(f) The Secretary, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall assist the Navajo Nation in the protection and management of those Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites located on lands under the jurisdiction of the Navajo Nation through a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement entered into pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination and Education Act (Public Law 93-638), as amended, to assist the Navajo Nation in site planning, resource protection, interpretation, resource management actions, and such other purposes as may be identified in such grant, contract, or cooperative agreement. This cooperative assistance shall include assistance with the development of a Navajo facility to serve those who seek to appreciate the Chacoan Outlier Sites."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 517, a bill to improve the management and protection of the Chaco outliers in the Four Corners region.

Mr. Speaker, in 1980 Congress recognized the outstanding collection of archeological sites related to the Anasazi ruins at Chaco Canyon and established the Chaco outliers as additional resources worthy of recognition and protection. Subsequent analysis by the interagency team overseeing the management of these sites has led to the development of this legislation; which deletes some sites, adds other sites, and modifies the boundaries at some existing sites.

This is a good bill. I particularly want to note that this legislation provides for cooperative management of these sites by the Federal Government, native Americans, and private property owners. This is a good model which underscores the point that the Federal Government does not need to own cultural resources in order to ensure their protection.

I commend the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. RICHARDSON] for his long-standing efforts to complete work on this bill, and I am pleased that we are able to move it early in the session. I urge all my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, first let me congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN], for his outstanding bipartisan work, and, I must say, most productive work that he has initiated in our subcommittee. I think it is close to 10 bills that are moving through the House, perhaps even more, and I want to thank the gentleman for his fairness, his bipartisanship, and his immense productivity. I hope it continues throughout this session.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in strong support of H.R. 517, legislation I introduced in January to protect outlying sites at the Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Site in my congressional district in northwestern New Mexico.

The entire New Mexico congressional delegation has spent the better part of 10 years working to pass this legislation, which would correct several inequities resulting from passage of the last Chaco-related legislation in 1980. I am pleased that Chairmen HANSEN and YOUNG and their staffs have recognized the importance of this legislation by ensuring its timely consideration in the House early in this session. I would like to thank them for their leadership.

The name Chaco Canyon comes from the Chaco culture, the single most important prehistoric culture in the Western United States, which is known to have lived in the area. The Chaco culture site in New Mexico contains spectacular archaeological remains of the native American past, which have long been recognized as representing an archaeological peak in Anasazi Indian prehistory.

The Resources Committee considered this bill earlier this year, and did not make any changes to the bill as introduced. The bill would authorize alterations in the area including the addition of the Morris 41 site to the list of what will now be 39 outlying sites, the addition of clarifying language regarding the role of the National Park Service in working fully with the Navajo

Nation to ensure that the sites are managed responsibly, and the addition of new language authorizing the acquisition of lands for the purpose of completing the inclusion of the new outlying sites.

New Mexico's senior Senator, PETE DOMENICI, has joined me in introducing identical legislation in the Senate. I am pleased that Senator DOMENICI has secured a subcommittee markup of this legislation in the Subcommittee on Parks, Historic Preservation and Recreation for tomorrow. With the Senator's fine leadership, I look forward to the swift consideration and passage of this legislation in the Senate as well.

I am confident that the provisions of H.R. 517 are reflective of the unique needs of this culturally significant site. I welcome the passage of H.R. 517 today and look forward to its enactment into law in the very near future.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 517.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable CHRISTOPHER SHAYS, Member of Congress:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
March 9, 1995.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,  
Speaker of the House, the Capitol, Washington,  
DC.

DEAR NEWT: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has received a subpoena for testimony and documents concerning constituent casework. The subpoena was issued by the Superior court for the Judicial District of Fairfield County in the State of Connecticut.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and precedents of the House.

Sincerely,

CHRISTOPHER SHAYS,  
Member of Congress.

□ 1515

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRIBUTE TO LTC MARY LOU SMULLEN

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, today I want to congratulate LTC Mary Lou Smullen who will retire from the U.S. Army on May 1, 1995, after a distinguished 20-year career of service to our Nation. I am particularly pleased to note that a significant portion of that service relates directly to the Congress.

Lieutenant Colonel Smullen graduated from Ohio University in Athens, OH, after majoring in radio and television broadcasting. In April of 1975, following a short foray into the business sector, she sought and accepted a direct appointment as a second lieutenant in the Women's Army Corps.

During her first assignment, then-lieutenant Smullen immediately established a reputation for excellence, creativity, and mission accomplishment. In a series of high profile positions at the U.S. Army Signal School and Center at Fort Gordon, GA, involving public affairs and protocol she excelled and began polishing skills that would serve her exceptionally well in future assignments. Perhaps the highlight of her tour at Fort Gordon was a weekly television show titled "On the Move" that she produced, wrote, and appeared in, that covered stories of local interest. This well-received show was eventually picked up and broadcast as a public service on one of the local commercial television stations.

Our very best officers actively seek duty with soldiers and Mary Lou Smullen is no exception. In the early 1980's, the U.S. Army in Europe was one of the most challenging places to serve with soldiers. Tough, realistic training and competent, confident leaders maintained the warrior's edge as America's Army stood ready to defend Western Europe from the Warsaw Pact.

Effective personnel administration is one of the many important, yet unheralded tasks, that contribute to maintaining trained and ready forces in the field. We want to be sure that utmost care is taken of America's sons and daughters. We want to be sure our soldiers are properly assigned, promoted, schooled, rewarded, and disciplined. And that is exactly what then-Captain Smullen did as chief of officer records for the Fifth U.S. Corps and later as commander of the 64th Adjutant General Replacement Detachment, and chief of the Enlisted Assignment Section for the Fifth Corps. Well over 21,000 soldiers in over 106 units directly benefited from LTC Smullen's exceptional efforts. She went on to serve with distinction as the Assistant Secretary for the General Staff for Protocol for the Fifth Corps and found the time somehow, to earn a mas-

ter's degree in international relations from Troy State University at its overseas campus.

LTC Smullen's educational background, experience, and demonstrated performance resulted in her next assignment as assistant public affairs officer for the Armed Forces Inaugural Committee. Once again she set herself apart from her peers by exhibiting exceptional skill, intelligence, and innovation. The information briefings, historical, and art programs she deftly developed established a standard that is still looked to today.

Each service assigns congressional liaison officers to offices on the Hill that perform a particularly important function keeping Congress adequately apprised of myriad programs so we can make informed decisions regarding defense authorizations and appropriations. Few positions within the services have such direct impact on the services' programs as these liaison positions. Accordingly, the services strive mightily to assign only their best officers to liaison positions on Capitol Hill. LTC Smullen was the Army's first female officer assigned to such a liaison position on Capitol Hill. This action testifies to the degree of trust and confidence senior Army leadership placed in this superb officer. She did such a fine job for the Army that the Office of the Secretary of Defense sought her transfer and she went on to provide liaison between the Secretary of Defense and Congress in matters relating to all weapons systems procurements, command control and communications issues, and chemical matters.

Few of our serving military officers ever get the opportunity to work on Capitol Hill as bona fide members of the congressional staff. Perhaps the ultimate indicator of LTC Smullen's special talents was her selection and assignment as a special assistant to the staff director on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress. This historic effort, pursued only twice before in the history of our Republic, was supported by an extremely small staff. LTC Mary Lou Smullen played a key role in the joint committee's activities. She coordinated research and background of legislative-executive relations, chose the best witnesses, analyzed the correct solutions for the joint committee to recommend, oversaw preparation of all outgoing constituent correspondence signed by members, and prepared all correspondence for the National Archives. All these tasks were accomplished in an exemplary fashion, and many of the committee's recommendations are under consideration by the current Congress for implementation.

Since completing work with the joint committee, LTC Smullen has been serving as a special assistant to the Army's Chief of Legislative Liaison and has continued to excel in a position with many and varied challenges. Excellence continues as her hallmark.

The role of women in our Armed Forces has been a topic of much discussion over the past several years. Throughout our history women have served America's Army in many substantive and diverse roles: Mary Ludwig McCauley, alias Molly Pitcher, Dr. Mary Edwards Walker, Mary Hallaren, and Mary E. Clarke have inspired generations of women to seek an opportunity to serve our Nation. Like them, Mary Lou Smullen heard the call. In her own way, LTC Smullen has played an active

part in effecting important changes within America's Army. These changes have not occurred quickly. However, they have rooted deeply within the institution itself. Often have I heard the Army claim that senior leaders cannot be hired off the street. They must be nurtured and grown within the institution. The very fact that we have senior Army officers like LTC Smullen actively engaged in sensitive, important, and demanding positions is ample testament that the Army has indeed kept pace with the cultural changes that have occurred in the rest of American society. The Women's Army Corps was eliminated shortly after LTC Smullen graduated from its basic course. She has been in the vanguard of change that has permeated America's Army, setting an example, breaking down long-established barriers, and disproving widely held stereotypes.

On a personal note, I would point out that LTC Smullen was one of the escort officers for a Veterans' Affairs Committee trip several years ago to Corregidor and talks with Filipino officials regarding the restoration of the memorial to United States troops on the island. She proved to be an excellent escort officer and contributed greatly to the success of the trip.

Mary Lou Smullen is a consummate professional. She has personified those traits of professionalism, integrity, and competence that our Nation has come to expect from its Army officers. When she was needed, she was there. She has served our country well and our heartfelt appreciation and best wishes go with LTC Smullen as she prepares for the future.

IN OPPOSITION TO VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION RESCISSIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no designee of the majority leader at this time, under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the topic of my discussion will be the rescission cuts. There have been many targeted, including children and the elderly, but worst of all have been the veterans, and I rise today in behalf of the veterans throughout this Nation.

There is a national disgrace in this country that must be addressed now. We all know that American men and women in the prime of their lives willingly go to remote parts of the world to defend their country. Sometimes they do not return. Sometimes they return wounded. Sometimes they return with wounds that do not surface until years later. War is never without human cost, and for this reason we have a longstanding contract with our brave warriors that goes something like this: "If you will stand in harm's way for me, I will care for you later."

On February 24, a day of disgrace, the House Appropriations Committee with Republican leadership voted to rescind \$206 million in fiscal year 1995 from the VA appropriations. During the full

committee markup on March 2, the Republicans voted to support those cuts.

This rescission money was intended to fund six VA ambulatory care projects totaling \$200 million. It is a national disgrace that veterans' programs are a part of this rescission list, a list that was quickly and thoughtlessly compiled. These canceled projects prevent us from expanding our outpatient service, a national trend in health care delivery and making our health care system more efficient and cost-effective. These canceled projects are aimed at one of the most deserving groups in our society, veterans after World War II and the Korean conflict. These veterans and all veterans should expect and receive good care. If we cannot protect them at this time in their time of need, how can we ask them to stand in harm's way to protect us?

GOP says veterans health is not a priority.—The Republicans' message is clear: the health of our Nation's veterans is not a priority. Clearly, they feel that reducing vital medical services to needy veterans is an appropriate way to pay for tax cuts for the wealthy.

All these funds have been carefully considered.—The Department of Veterans Affairs has ranked the six targeted ambulatory care projects as priorities. In fiscal year 1995, the Department proposed to fund these projects, all of which have been authorized, as part of the veterans health care investment fund.

Ambulatory care saves taxpayer dollars.—The ambulatory care projects are an integral part of the Department's plan to move away from costly inpatient care and provide more accessible, cost effective and efficient outpatient care. Ultimately, all of these projects will save the VA medical system more money.

These projects will provide better care.—The projects will allow VA to better meet the workload experienced by the transfer of expensive inpatient care to a less costly ambulatory setting.

These projects will allow VA to deliver managed outpatient care and will greatly improve VA's ability to deliver primary care.

These projects will correct serious safety and space deficiencies in ambulatory care areas of affiliated referral facilities or in undersized leased satellite clinics.

Presently, the clinic space available at these proposed facilities was designed for workloads of 50 to 60 percent of current workloads. The lack of space results in appointment delays and overcrowding.

Veterans take the hit to pay for taxcuts for the wealthy.—These cuts are not only "penny-wise and pound-foolish," but also wrong. These cuts are aimed at the most vulnerable groups in our society—aging World War II and Korean conflict veterans and others who have sacrificed so much for our Nation.

Members will have another chance to get their priorities straight.—Support restoring this vital funding when this ill-conceived rescission package is brought to the floor next week. Do not let our veterans down. They deserve better.

Orlando Satellite Outpatient Clinic and Nursing Home.—The fiscal year 1995 appropriation is \$14 million. This project will allow the VA to

better provide primary and preventive care and address long-term care needs in the Orlando area. It renovates the Orlando Naval Training Center hospital for use as a VA satellite outpatient clinic and nursing home care unit. It will replace the existing leased undersized clinic which was sized to accommodate less than one-half of the visits currently experienced in Orlando. The project will allow the VA to provide excellent primary and preventive care and long-term care in the Orlando area. Since June 1994, there have been 15,000 veteran patient visits to the Orlando Satellite Outpatient Clinic—120,000 visits are expected by the end of 1995.

The existing clinic is in three separate buildings approximately one-half mile from each other and cannot be expanded further in present location. Unsuccessful efforts have been made for the past 6 years to obtain acceptable replacement lease space. Existing space lacks sufficient examining rooms, waiting areas, and bathrooms with no privacy for examining women veterans. This project will allow for 120 new beds without new construction by renovating an existing building.

Gainesville ambulatory care addition.—The ambulatory care addition will be added to the main hospital building. Ambulatory surgery facilities and an outpatient pharmacy will be included along with clinic space. The addition will allow the VA medical center to provide primary and preventive care in an ambulatory setting, as well as correct severe space and functional deficiencies and add much needed ambulatory care space.

The fiscal year 1995 appropriation is \$17,812,000. The current ambulatory care facility was constructed in 1966. Present ambulatory care is 35 percent space deficient and handles over 133,000 visits a year. Services are spread over several floors making it confusing and physically difficult for many handicapped patients.

The emergency room is a converted hallway with treatment and support spaces on either side of the hall. Administrative duties take place in the hallway along with movement of patient, supply, staff, and visitor traffic.

Mr. Speaker, I will now yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. SANFORD BISHOP].

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, thanks to the men and women who have served in the Armed Forces, we Americans live in the freest, the most bountiful, and the most secure country in the world. All of us will agree, I am sure, that we owe each and every one of our veterans a deep debt of gratitude. On patriotic holidays we express our thanks in speeches and parades, and well we should, because when our veterans signed up and answered the call with their faithful service to our Nation, our Government in essence issued a promissory note, a check assuring them certain basic benefits, including education and job training opportunities, housing assistance, and a health care system that specifically serves veterans, the veterans' population, when they need it, for life.

It will be a tragic day, Mr. Speaker, if that check is ever returned marked "Insufficient Funds." In essence, that is exactly what will be happening if Congress votes to support the more than \$206 million in VA rescissions the Appropriations Committee is recommending, rescissions that will eliminate critically needed high-priority improvements in the veterans' health care system that must sooner or later be implemented if the system is to meet its needs in the immediate years ahead.

These funds are earmarked for six ambulatory care projects totaling \$156 million and medical equipment purchases totaling \$50 million. The ambulatory care projects are needed to carry out the projected transfer of many inpatient-care patients to a more cost-effective outpatient care. In the long run it will cost much more money to continue to hospitalize many thousands of patients who could be treated on an outpatient basis. Rescinding this investment makes no sense from either a financial standpoint or a medical standpoint. It will prevent the Veterans' Administration from moving to more cost-effective and efficient operations. This means higher costs for current services and fewer resources for meeting future needs.

The VA health care system must either move forward or it will inevitably face decline, and that will be tantamount to breaking our promise.

Mr. Speaker, veterans are already shouldering their share of the burden of budget cuts in recent years, and then some. The Budget Reconciliation Acts of 1990 and 1993 alone have cut VA benefits and services by nearly \$7 billion. Additional cuts can be expected in the VA budget that Congress will consider for the next fiscal year, and now on top of all this the House Appropriations Committee is proposing that Congress slash VA health care funds already appropriated and included in the current budget. Either we keep our promise to provide a quality health care system for our veterans or we renege on that promise. This is the fundamental issue that we will be debating when this ill-conceived rescissions package is brought to the floor next week.

In addition to the personal sacrifices that veterans have made in the defense of our country, we will be asking them to sacrifice benefits and services that have been promised and approved.

Mr. Speaker, let us keep our word. Let us restore these funds. Vote to build the VA health care system, not tear it down.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman respond to a question?

Mr. BISHOP. Yes, I will, if the gentlewoman will yield further.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman serves on the authorizing committee, and can he tell me

whether or not anyone on the authorizing committee was contacted by anyone from the administration or anyone from the Secretary's office pertaining to these cuts or whether it is politics the old-fashioned way, a group of good old boys getting together and making these decisions?

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, as the gentlewoman is aware, we had hearings in the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I think the Secretary appeared and indicated that he had not been consulted, and I think that the committee records would reveal that probably there were no consultations from the authorizing committee. This was something that happened *sui sponte*. There was no consultation at all, and I think, as the gentlewoman alludes to it, this was the old-fashioned way of doing things, and apparently that is what we are faced with.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have one followup question: What does the gentleman think about the reverse Robin Hood procedure, robbing from the poor to give to the rich?

Mr. BISHOP. I feel that it is a slap in the face to our Nation's veterans. I feel that it is certainly a disservice to our Nation's veterans, and it is tantamount, as I said earlier, to having the check come back marked "Insufficient Funds."

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman think there is a lot of waste as far as the dollars we spend on veterans?

Mr. BISHOP. No, no, they are cost-effective dollars, very cost-effective.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend, the distinguished leader of the Black Caucus and the leader in the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. LOUIS STOKES.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the distinguished gentlewoman from Florida, Ms. CORRINE BROWN, for reserving this hour to discuss a very important issue, cuts in programs which serve our Nation's veterans. I feel very strongly about the issue and I am pleased to participate in this special order.

For a number of years, I have been privileged to serve on the House Appropriations Subcommittee which funds the Veterans' Administration and its programs. I am currently the ranking Democrat on that subcommittee. As it relates to veterans issues, this important panel oversees the \$37 billion budget to provide medical care, compensation and pension payments, educational training and vocational assistance, and housing assistance for our Nation's veterans.

As a member of this subcommittee and as a veteran, I have been proud of

our legislative efforts to provide and care for those brave men and women who have risked their lives in service to this country. It is for this reason and in their defense that I rise today.

This Nation has been fortunate to have been defended by many men who gave the last full measure of devotion for this country; namely their lives. Others were wounded, crippled, and disabled, all in the name of service to their country. Many who served are now in the twilight of their lives. This is why the recent vote by the full Appropriations Committee to drastically cut \$206 million in funding for programs that serve our Nation's veterans is unacceptable and unconscionable. That these cuts come from funds earmarked for medical equipment and ambulatory care facilities is an even greater disservice to this Nation's veterans.

In hearings last week before the VA/ HUD and Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee on the fiscal year 1996 budget, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown, gave moving testimony about the proposed rescissions and the impact on our veterans. He told us that these rescissions would prevent the Veterans' Administration from providing quality care for our veterans. He told us that he was shocked at this unprecedented departure from providing care for veterans.

I think it important that everyone understand and know that quality health care for our veterans has always been a top priority in previous Congresses. These rescissions supported by our Republican colleagues are an unprecedented departure from this longstanding tradition of supporting this Nation's veterans.

Furthermore, these actions come at a time when the Secretary himself acknowledges the unacceptable conditions of many of the Nation's VA hospitals. In fact, the Veterans' Administration currently has an unmet need of necessary medical equipment exceeding three-quarters of a billion dollars. The rescissions bill passed by the Appropriations Committee would increase that unmet need by at least \$50 million.

I would ask my colleagues how we can even consider such reductions when information we hear daily tells us of new and emerging medical conditions being experienced by veterans? At a time when veterans medical centers and medical teams are recognizing and attempting to address these problems, these cuts come from previously appropriated funds which were to be used to purchase such types of equipment as CAT scanners, x rays, EKG machines, and other vital items. Private hospitals have access to this equipment, and can replace and improve their inventory; so should the medical centers caring for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, even more shocking is the \$156 million reduction in construction projects. These funds are targeted for ambulatory care facilities. This represents a crucial aspect of the VA's medical care agenda at a time when our aging World War II veterans are requiring more medical assistance. Not only are they older, but these veterans require more long-term care. Clearly, this is not the time to cut back on ambulatory care facilities—especially in States such as Florida which has the fastest growing and aging veterans population.

Our Republican counterparts argue that these rescissions are necessary to offset the costs of the California earthquake and other natural disasters. I would respond that these cuts will create an even greater disaster for thousands of veterans. I would argue further that if these actions are intended to offset the cost of future tax cuts—including capital gains for middle-class families and affluent investors—it is unconscionable. I cannot support legislation which views tax cuts for the wealthy to be a higher priority than needed veterans medical equipment and facilities.

We must stand up for our Nation's veterans. These brave men and women have dutifully served this country. We owe them the same full measure of devotion they gave in protecting this Nation with their lives. I want to thank my distinguished colleague from Florida for the opportunity to address this important issue, and commend her for the fight she is waging to restore funds to these veterans projects.

□ 1530

Many who served are now in the twilight of their lives. This is why the recent vote by the full Appropriations Committee to drastically cut \$206 million in funding for programs that serve our Nation's veterans is unacceptable and unconscionable. But these cuts come from funds earmarked for medical equipment and ambulatory care facilities which is an even greater disservice to this Nation's veterans.

In hearings last week before the VA, HUD, Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee on the fiscal year 1996 budget, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Jesse Brown, gave moving testimony about the proposed rescissions and the impact on our veterans. He told us that these rescissions would prevent the Veterans' Administration from providing quality care for our veterans. He told us that he was shocked at this unprecedented departure from providing care for our veterans.

I think it is important that everyone understand and know that quality health care for our veterans has always been a top priority in previous Congresses. These rescissions, supported by

our Republican colleagues, are an unprecedented departure from this longstanding tradition of supporting this Nation's veterans.

Furthermore, these actions come at a time when the Secretary himself acknowledges the unacceptable conditions of many of the Nation's VA hospitals. In fact, the Veterans' Administration currently has an unmet need of necessary medical equipment exceeding three-quarters of a billion dollars. The rescissions bill passed by the Appropriations Committee would increase that unmet need by at least \$50 million.

I would ask my colleagues, how can we even consider such reductions when information we hear daily tells us of new and emerging medical conditions being experienced by veterans at a time when veterans medical centers and medical teams are recognizing and attempting to address these problems?

These cuts come from previously appropriated funds which were to be used to purchase such types of equipment as CAT scanners, x rays, EKG machines, and other vital items. Private hospitals have access to this equipment and can replace and improve their inventory. So should the medical centers caring for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, even more shocking is the \$156 million reduction in construction projects. These funds are targeted for ambulatory care facilities. This represents a crucial aspect of the VA's medical care agenda at a time when our aging World War II veterans are requiring more medical assistance. Not only are they older but these veterans now require more long-term care.

Clearly this is not the time to cut back on ambulatory care facilities, especially in States such as Florida, which has the fastest growing and aging veterans population.

Our Republican counterparts argue that these rescissions are necessary to offset the cost of the California earthquake and other natural disasters. I would respond that these cuts will create an even greater disaster for thousands of veterans.

I would argue further that if these actions are intended to offset the cost of future tax cuts, including capital gains for middle-class families and influential investors, it is unconscionable.

I cannot support legislation which views tax cuts for the wealthy to be a higher priority than needed veterans medical equipment and facilities. We must stand up for this Nation's veterans. These brave men and women have dutifully served this country. We owe them the same full measure of devotion they gave in protecting this Nation with their lives.

I want to thank my distinguished colleague for Florida for the opportunity to address this important issue and I commend her for the fight she is

waging to restore funds for these veterans' projects.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. You served on the Committee on Appropriations. Can you give us a little insight as to the process, whether or not—how this decision to attack the veterans came about? I know I serve on the authorizing committee and we were not notified. I spoke with the administration. They were not contacted, nor was the Secretary.

Is this politics the old-time way, back room, pizza, discovery and decisions made in closed doors?

Mr. STOKES. I would be pleased to try to respond to the gentlewoman's question. I could say to the gentlewoman that this particular subcommittee took a greater hit than any other subcommittee on the Appropriations Committee. The total in rescissions was about \$17.3 billion. Of that amount, the VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee contributed about \$9.3 billion. That is about 54 percent of the total amount of those cuts. And of course veterans took a hit of about \$206 million, which was substantial in terms of this.

There was no scientific way of arriving at these figures. These were the figures brought in in terms of the Chairman's mark, and of course the subcommittee approved that mark. There is nothing logical, nothing by way of formula. These were just figures that were reached up and arrived at.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Not based on any need factor or—

Mr. STOKES. None that I am aware of and I participated fully in that markup and at which time I opposed these cuts to our veterans programs.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Can you briefly just tell us about some of the other cuts? One in particular, in the area of housing, I have a series of town meetings, probably more than anyone else in Congress, and the two areas that always come up, one is crime and two, housing, affordable housing. There is a lot of concern as far as senior citizens. Can you discuss housing and some of the other cuts briefly?

Mr. STOKES. I would be pleased to respond to the gentlewoman that the Department of HUD, Housing and Urban Development, took about 42 percent of the total rescission cuts out of that \$17.3 billion cut. The actual cuts from HUD alone were about \$7.3 billion. Programs were hit, such as operating subsidies, the preservation funds, modernization funds, the assisted housing account. Then the lead-based paint program, which enables us to be able to try and repair some of the damage done to the Nation's youth, particularly in our inner cities where these young children are subjected to paint and, as a result of it, suffer and are impaired with brain damage, which is often irreversible. Along with it, the Community Development Block Grant Program

also sustained a large hit in terms of the cuts, and of course that affects almost every local and urban community around the Nation.

So these are some of the major cuts that came out, and of course also tomorrow I am hoping to have an amendment on the floor when the bill comes up that would restore about \$2 billion of the cuts from VA and also from these housing programs.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. What about weatherization? That program, who benefits from that program and was that program also targeted for cuts?

Mr. STOKES. I do not believe that the weatherization program was part of that program.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. What about jobs, the summer jobs program?

Mr. STOKES. Summer jobs program is in the rescission cuts, comes out of the Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education Subcommittee on Appropriations. All the summer jobs were cut. This is going to put an enormous amount of young people on our streets, particularly at a time when we are already encountering a great deal of unemployment in our inner cities and where, within the next 2 months, the mayors of these cities must get ready to provide these jobs for these young people during the summer months, and that is one of the programs that is just totally unconscionable to see that the youth of this Nation who depended upon summer jobs will not be provided them this summer if these rescissions prevail here in the House.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Can you explain for us—some of us, who are not familiar with the process, tell us a little about the rescission? Because it is my understanding we are talking about projects that have gone through the House of Representatives hearings, gone through the Senate, passed, the President has signed it into law, so we are talking about breaking out of a contract that we have already signed in many cases?

Mr. STOKES. These are from appropriated funds. They were in the fiscal year 1995 bill and they were funds that were already appropriated and signed into law, and of course this is a Congress coming back again rescinding action that it had previously taken in the last Congress where both the House and the Senate had passed on this legislation, had sent it to the President for his signature.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Does this include the school lunch program?

Mr. STOKES. The school lunch program is not in our rescissions. That is in some other legislation that will be coming to the floor and it will not be in the \$17.3 billion rescission bill.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Can you explain to us the difference between a block grant and a program—you know, we have had block grants before. In fact, I think when we had it, President

Ronald Reagan stopped it because the money was not going where it was intended.

Can you tell us a little bit about it? Because I am very supportive of the present school lunch program that started in 1946 under President Truman, and the reason why this program was started was because it was in the national interest of this country to take care of our young people and they couldn't pass the physical. So that is why we invested in our young people.

Mr. STOKES. The gentlelady is certainly correct. One of the problems in terms of block granting many of these types of programs is the fact that each State has different regulations and standards with reference to these programs.

Many of them adopt a different type of program and in the absence of Federal standards, Federal guidelines, and Federal guidance to those programs, you will find a diminution of many of the programs in many of the States and you will find varied and different types of programs and not those which have been directed under the Federal aegis.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I have been in this House for 2 years, which is not a lot of time, but I spent 10 years in the Florida House of Representatives. We passed a lot of bills out of this House, but I have never seen the process so broken down. As a Member that has served in the House, I have always been proud of the work, the deliberation of the House. Now I thank God for the Senate.

Can you tell us or share your experience with us about the process and how it has been working over these past how many days? It is not 100. We passed one bill to my knowledge.

Mr. STOKES. I think certainly for those of us who consider ourselves as legislators and those of us who take pride in sponsoring legislation and being able to create programs that help people, not only our own constituency, but people throughout the Nation, and many of us have taken great pride in the fact that over the years we were able to not only craft those programs but able to put the proper amount of funding into those kinds of programs and we have seen people benefit from it.

We have seen those who fall in the category of being low-income people, the poor, the disadvantaged, minorities, those who are dependent upon government, be able to survive in our society at a time when they needed help in order to be able to move on to the next stage of their lives, and to now see what is happening in terms of the kind of cuts that are coming.

You earlier mentioned cuts in the food stamps, nutrition programs, the WIC, which is the Women, Infants, and Children Program, to see cuts now coming in programs such as summer

jobs and Healthy Start, which is for mothers and little children, and when you see the type of rescissions that are in this bill that is coming out to the floor tomorrow, as one who is interested in people and trying to provide for the people in this country, you could just deem it totally unconscionable that we are doing this to people at a time in this country when all Americans are entitled to be represented by those who serve in this body in a way where they show some degree of compassion and understanding of our people's lives.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. The last question I must ask you, can you tell me who was left out of these cuts?

Mr. STOKES. Well, I can tell you this, that the defense bill was totally off the board. No cuts came in the defense program. Not a single item was cut from defense. That was just untouched. And so I can tell you that, and the other thing I think everybody needs to understand is that the President's request in terms of disaster relief was in the amount of \$6.7 billion.

□ 1545

The subcommittee on which I serve actually cut it down to \$5.3 billion. The difference between \$5.3 and the \$17.3 billion, which is substantial, somewhere in the neighborhood of \$11 billion, we have to ask ourselves, what are these cuts for, since the total amount of the rescission package is \$5.3 billion. So the difference between \$5.3 and \$17.3 then is what the Republicans call a savings. Of course, the savings we all know obviously is going to go for the tax cut for the rich, so the Republicans, as usual, are robbing from the poor to give to the rich.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so much for his insight, his information, and for coming and taking the time to share with the American people what has been going on in the 104th Congress.

Mr. STOKES. I thank the gentlewoman.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ].

As he is coming up, I would like to share with the House this picture. It says "Uncle Sam wants you." It is a commitment that we made to our veterans: If you will support us, if you will go and fight for us, we will be there for you.

I yield to the gentleman from Puerto Rico.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, that was a contract that the Congress, back when these veterans were coming home, had with our veterans that preserved the freedoms that we have. To me, that contract is just as important,

if not more important, than the Contract With America.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is really important. I just returned from Haiti. I talked to the commander down there. He talked about the fact that we need to take care of our men and the missions will take care of themselves. We are talking about people who have committed themselves, have served this country, and now we are just tossing them out. They are not important.

I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, last week the House Committee on Appropriations voted to cut six Veterans' Administration ambulatory projects totaling \$156 million, and \$50 million in medical equipment purchases, which already face an \$800 million backlog.

One of these projects happens to be the San Juan Veterans' Administration Medical Center outpatient clinic addition, a project designed to address a 15-year problem of severe overcrowding of the facility. The area currently used for ambulatory care in the San Juan VA Medical Center provides only 40 percent of the space required, according to VA standards, and that is cutting it short.

Therefore, temporary measures, such as converting storage space and corridors into clinical and office space, have been the mode of addressing these chronic space deficiencies for many years. Currently, some outpatient clinics and medical examinations are being performed in the hallways and nursing stations of the facility, and exit corridors have been converted into additional waiting areas, potentially compromising the health and safety of both patients and visitors.

The Secretary of Veterans' Affairs came down to Puerto Rico. We insisted he come down and see it for himself. He did not believe the conditions that he saw there in the outpatient clinics.

The ambulatory care addition would allow the medical center to relocate all outpatient functions into a one-story addition adjacent to the existing main hospital. This will correct all our patient safety, accreditation, functional and space deficiencies, and adapt space for handicapped accessibility and for women veterans.

A parking garage is also scheduled to be constructed to replace the parking lot, due to the siting of the ambulatory care addition. Land at home is very scarce and very expensive. This is why a new parking building is being built instead of buying additional land.

Further, San Juan is the only VA Medical Center for the entire veteran population within Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Demand for care has consistently been much higher than on the mainland. Mr. Speaker, approximately 35 percent of veterans in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands use the VA facilities, compared

to the 12 percent national average. Let me explain why.

Because Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are Territories, they do not share or do not participate in the Medicaid Program. What does that mean? That means that the poor veterans, the veterans that do not have health insurance, the veterans that cannot afford to pay a doctor or pay the hospital, when they go to a private hospital they cannot afford it, so they have to go to the public hospital or the Veterans' Administration facilities.

The public hospitals in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands are not up to par with the private hospitals and the private facilities, so the veterans would be getting a second class type of health treatment, so they insist on going to the Veterans' Administration. That is logical and that is to be expected. That is where they can get the best treatment.

This is why here in the Nation, in the 50 States where they have a Medicaid Program, the poor veterans do not need to go necessarily to the VA hospitals. They can go to private hospitals, to a private clinic, to a private doctor, and Medicaid will pay for it, but in Puerto Rico there is no Medicaid Program, so their only choice is the Veterans' Administration facilities. This is why it is even more imperative that these facilities be expanded.

After a 15-year struggle by the Puerto Rican veterans and the Virgin Islands veterans, Congress has finally appropriated the necessary funding, \$34.8 million, to finalize construction of the vitally needed outpatient clinics of the San Juan VA Medical Center last year. The project had been authorized and \$4 million had been appropriated for its design a year earlier.

Puerto Rico's 145,000 veterans, particularly the sick and the disabled, celebrated this long-awaited achievement. Only now, when they were celebrating the achievement, waiting for the contract to be signed, for the construction to start, all of a sudden the House Committee on Appropriations decided to take away all of the funds a few months later.

However, the fact that strikes me the most is that these proposed cuts will be particularly devastating to the VA Medical system, because the targeted facilities are all ambulatory care facilities. The rescissions come at a time when the VA is involved in the effort of shifting from hospital inpatient care to outpatient and noninstitutional care settings, which is in keeping with the new general trend in providing medical care throughout the Nation.

The Veterans' Administration has been called by Congress over and over again to stop investing so much money in hospitals and to invest more money in outpatient clinics. Now, the Veterans' Administration has responded to the Congress, it is beginning to invest

in outpatient clinics, and all of a sudden Congress takes the money away. The money spent on outpatient facilities to prevent a veteran from going into the hospital is a savings for the Federal Government. It is a savings for the Nation.

If you do not take care of the patient while he can still walk, is still ambulatory, can live at home, then what happens is eventually then he has to go into the hospital, and the medical and hospital care is much, much more expensive, so instead of saving money we are actually spending more money.

In the words of the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the gentleman from Arizona, BOB STUMP, I will quote from his February 28 letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana, BOB LIVINGSTON:

The particular projects selected for rescission by the subcommittee are, unfortunately, the type of projects that the Veterans Affairs' Committee has been encouraging the VA to pursue. It is my strong belief, shared by veterans and their service organizations, that giving greater priority to ambulatory care projects is clearly the right approach to improve service to veterans.

Mr. STUMP went on to conclude: "In striking contrast to the needs the VA faces, these cuts move the VA in the wrong direction."

The Department of Veterans' Affairs has consistently ranked the six targeted ambulatory projects as one of its highest priorities. They are an integral part of the department's effort to move away from costly inpatient care and provide more accessible, cost-effective and efficient outpatient care.

However, by proposing the rescission of these six projects, the Republicans are sending a very clear message: The health of our Nation's veterans is not a priority to this Congress.

However, we owe a great debt to our veterans. A reduction in hard-earned medical services to deserving veterans is not the way to pay for a tax cut for the wealthy. Cutting high-priority veterans' projects is plain wrong.

I urge my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, but particularly the Republicans, to set their priorities straight and support the restoring of the vital funding when this ill-conceived rescissions package is brought to the floor next week.

Mr. VOLKMER. Will the gentleman yield, Mr. Speaker?

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. VOLKMER. Would the gentleman also, as the gentlewoman from Florida, consider this a breach of the contract that Congress has with our veterans, especially our World War II veterans?

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. I definitely do, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if we can really call this a Contract With America. It looks more like a contract for the wealthy of America, and it is being performed on the backs of the poor, the

children and the elderly and the veterans.

Mr. VOLKMER. This money that they are taking from these outpatient clinics, yours, mine, those of the gentlewoman from Florida [Ms. BROWN] and others, is going to go for tax cuts, and 75 percent of that money goes to the wealthy?

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. The gentleman is right. They quote the theory that the less taxes the wealthy pay, the more money there will be, but yet, they have to make cuts to meet those tax cuts. They have to cut another project.

Mr. VOLKMER. I want to give another problem with what I call the generational gap, Mr. Speaker. If you review and look at the age of the Members of the majority party, many of them are too young to have served, basically, in the armed services in time of war with Uncle Sam's Army, our Army, our Marines, our Air Force.

As a result, I think this generational gap has led to the point where they, perhaps, do not realize the importance of what those people that fought in those wars did for us in preserving our freedoms.

I am afraid that you may see another part of what I call the generational gap that is going to occur. I understand there may be an amendment to restore these funds when we get into the bill by someone from the majority side, but I have been told that the money is going to come from further rescissions in the Americorps Program.

In other words, it will do away completely with Americorps, which is a program for our youth, in order to help the veterans. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is necessary.

I have an amendment that I will be offering, if I am given the opportunity, that does not perform that generational function and pit one generation against another, but it does restore the money by taking it out of funds under NAFTA for Mexico to do wastewater treatment, and also from NASA, from some of their operational programs, so it does not perform that generational problem that I see that the majority of amendments are going to do.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. There are some of the programs in NASA, some of the projects, that have not even been authorized. I think those are very reasonable projects to take it away from.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Could the gentleman tell me how long this project has been on the list, how long it has been authorized and been going through the process? I know for 2 years we have discussed it.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Our project was authorized in 1993. We got the funding for the planning and got the plans to get the construction project going. Then the authorization came last year.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I remember in the testimony before our committee, you discussed the fact that there were no facilities for women, no waiting rooms. People were in the hall. It is just one mess.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. That is correct. Not only that, but when the veterans ask for an appointment, because of the crowding of the facilities, instead of getting the appointment within a week, they will get the appointment sometimes 3 months, 4 months, 5 months later. Maybe before they get to the appointment their condition gets so much worse that they have to be hospitalized, even before they got to the appointment.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. That costs more money, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the gentleman from Puerto Rico, what does he think about this reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the poor to give to the rich?

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. That is what I call it. I have used that phrase quite a bit, because Puerto Rico is like an Apartheid society. We are U.S. citizens, 3,700,000 U.S. citizens, and we are not treated the same, either economically or politically. We are still struggling for our equality, at the end of the 20th century.

Definitely, this is also part of that Apartheid mentality, treating people differently, and also taking away from the poor to keep the rich.

In Puerto Rico we have a program where they have a tax-exemption for the large corporations. Because those large corporations are tax-exempt, the Federal Government tells us there is no money to give to the U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico, the same way U.S. citizens are treated in the 50 States of the Union.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. VOLKMER].

Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to bring the attention of the House to what I call the mean-spirited, hard-hearted manner in which the Committee on Appropriations and the subcommittee has refused to restore the funds that were authorized and appropriated to start outpatient clinics at six outpatient facilities, at six veterans' hospitals throughout this United States.

One of those is in my district. That hospital is named on behalf of the greatest President, in my opinion, that has ever served this country. It is the Harry S. Truman Veterans' Hospital in Columbia, MO.

□ 1600

That hospital was built in 1972 in order to take care of veterans' medical problems for not only the central and rural part of Missouri, since we also

have hospitals in St. Louis and elsewhere, but also for acute care for heart transplants, et cetera, throughout the Midwest.

It may be of interest to the Members to know that the number of veterans, especially World War II veterans, have gotten along in years. They have aged like the rest of us. They are no longer the 18-, the 19-, the 20-year-old that fought in the beaches of Omaha and in the plains of North Africa and in the islands of the Pacific to preserve the freedoms of this country.

At the time that they were fighting, when they came home, there was this commitment that we are going to take care of your medical needs, because many of them continued at that time and to the present time to need that medical care.

When the Harry S. Truman Hospital—and, by the way, we have to remember it was through the work of Harry Truman, then President, that terminated the Second World War, through his actions and what he did, not only of our fighting men but he as President. So I think it is very appropriate that the hospital be in his name, and he of course is a veteran of World War I and a recognized outstanding veteran of that war.

When that hospital was constructed in 1972, it was anticipated at that time that there would be a need for 12,000 patients a year. It may be of interest to Members to know that in the year 1992, there were 82,000 patients that went through that hospital, most of them outpatients. But they do not have the facilities, do not have the room to handle that many outpatients, and it has continued at that rate since that time.

It was suggested, and the Veterans Administration agreed, that we really should have an outpatient clinic to take care of outpatients and use the hospital for the inpatients. Working with Senator KIP BOND of Missouri, our senior Senator, we were able to persuade the Veterans Administration and this Congress, along with others, that this is the way to handle these patients, these veterans, through an outpatient clinic, so they did not have to wait.

How long do some of my veterans from my district have to wait? First let's say you are from Bowling Green and you served in the Second World War and whether it was in the Pacific or European theater makes no difference, or let's say it was in Korea, whether it was at Seoul or wherever in Korea, or whether it was in Vietnam, and let's say you live in Bowling Green, MO. Well, Bowling Green is about a 75-mile trip and so you get in your car and if you are not capable of driving, you get a neighbor and they drive you over to Columbia, and it takes you about an hour and 20 minutes, maybe an hour-and-a-half to get there.

So you start out, because you want to be there early because you know there is going to be a whole line of people there. So you start out about 6:30 or 7 o'clock in the morning and you drive to the hospital, and you get to the outpatient clinic. Lo and behold, you already have maybe 100 or 150 people already there, veterans, waiting, because we have a lot of veterans within that distance a lot closer. So you sit and wait, and sometimes, folks, they sit and wait almost all day just to see a doctor or a nurse to maybe find out exactly what they need to have, and then to maybe get a prescription.

Is that right, to tell your veterans—then they have to get in the car and drive back home—all day just to go through an outpatient clinic? That is what we are presently requiring of veterans that served in a world war.

I wonder how many people would like to serve this country in the future? I wonder how many of our young people would be willing to go serve when they told them, "We are not going to take care of you if you get shot up or if you lose an arm, or if you get a little disability or a large disability, we are not going to take care of you; you take care of yourself." I don't think we will have too many that would like to serve, anyway, and I think that would not help us any at all.

I know that we have an obligation, not only a moral obligation but an obligation as a country. If we are to have the respect of the rest of the world, we should take care of our veterans, and we are not doing it with this rescission bill. In fact, you are giving a slap in the face. You are actually telling your veterans, "You just go do your own thing, we are not going to do anything more for you."

As a result of that, I have an amendment that if I am permitted by the Committee on Rules, by the chairman of the committee when we get in the Committee of the Whole, I am going to offer to restore those funds, and I am sure that when that amendment is offered that the majority of the Members here will recognize the responsibility.

When it comes down to the question, the question really is, should this money—we are not saving any money by doing this. There is no savings, folks. I think everybody should recognize, we are not putting this money on the deficit. We are not telling our veterans, "Make a little sacrifice so it can reduce the deficit and help this country out."

No, we are saying, "Veterans, we want to take this 100 and some million dollars and we want to give it away to people for tax cuts, especially for those who have over \$125,000-a-year income. We want to help those people, because they, I guess, according to the majority, they are the ones that really need the help." The way I read this, the majority is saying the veterans don't need any help.

I am just anxiously waiting for the debate on this bill, because back when I was talking to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations about this, the gentleman from Louisiana, about this problem, he also made a statement to me that makes me really concerned about where this majority is going as far as our veterans are concerned. I do not remember the exact words, but the gist of it basically was, "HAROLD, we have got a bigger problem. We need to do something about our veterans hospitals. We need to do away with the veterans hospitals. We need to put the veterans on a voucher plan."

Those are the words that I got, and the understanding I got from the gentleman from Louisiana, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, from my conversation with him.

I wonder how many veterans groups out there know that that is the way that the majority feels? That the majority feels that we should close all of our veterans hospitals, we should not provide care for our veterans. All we do is give them a voucher and tell them, You go find the medical care wherever you can. That is the way that this is going with our majority.

I think they have lost sight of what again this Congress said to our veterans when they were preserving the freedoms that we all cherish and that we all now enjoy.

I feel that everybody in this House should recognize, and you among the general public should recognize, that we are having an onslaught against our veterans here in this Congress right now. And as one of those who feels that it is a wrong thing to do, I want the Members of this House to know that I am going to do everything I can to make sure, along with the gentleman that is here in the well and the gentleman from Florida, to make sure this money is replaced, and I know from my own knowledge that when it gets to the Senate, they are going to keep it in there. I know my senior Senator, KIP BOND, is going to keep it in there because he is one of those who believes strongly that we should provide for our veterans.

I know that all we have to do is win this battle here and we have won the battle. In the first place, though, it should have never been necessary. They should not even have thought of doing this.

For that reason, I say this was one of the most mean-spirited, hard-hearted things that the Members of Congress do, to actually give a slap in the face to a person who was willing to give his life for this country, in battle, and yet to slap him in the face and say, You go about your way, we don't care whether you get medical care or not.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, before we close, can the gentleman repeat his exact words?

Mr. VOLKMER. I don't know if I can say the exact words, but to me it is strictly a slap in the face to veterans. And these are the people, as depicted in these pictures and elsewhere, that with bullets flying around them were willing to give their life, and some of them gave their limbs, some of them gave their ability to even function so that we could stand here and speak today.

Yet the majority is saying, "Too bad. We don't care about you. We are going to give you a good slap in the face and tell you, you go take care of yourself." They are telling my veterans that were willing to sacrifice their life for the good of this country, willing to do that, they are telling them it is all right for them to have to spend 8, 10, 12 hours a day just to see a doctor, and that the majority says they do not deserve good medical care.

I say the opposite. I say that our veterans, that is a priority. They need to have the medical care that not only we should give them but that we promised them.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I thank the gentleman from Missouri.

I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. CLYBURN].

Mr. CLYBURN. I thank the gentleman from Florida for allowing me to participate in this special order. I am pleased to serve with the gentleman on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and I know of the gentleman's great commitment to the veterans of our Nation. And also to join with our friend from Missouri who too has displayed time and time again his concern for our veterans.

Mr. Speaker, I join the gentleman from Florida in her opposition to our Republican colleagues' plans to rescind funding for veterans programs. Our Republican colleagues have already displayed their callousness by proposing legislation that would harm our Nation's youth. Now they are going after our Nation's veterans, the men and women who have committed their lives to the defense of our country.

This so-called Contract With America has quickly revealed itself as a contract on Americans. The people who seem to be in the line of fire are the young and the helpless.

Is this how we want to honor our veterans, by rescinding \$206.1 million in fiscal year 1995 VA appropriations? Is this how we are going to care for our aging veterans, by rescinding money intended to fund 6 ambulatory health care projects totaling \$156 million, and \$50 million in medical equipment purchases?

Mr. Speaker, these facilities are not Government frills. This medical equipment, these are not Government frills. They all represent an alternative to costly inpatient care—by providing more accessible, cost-effective and efficient outpatient care.

Mr. Speaker, when this rescission bill comes to the floor, I am going to join

the gentleman from Missouri and the gentlewoman from Florida in opposing the bill and I will urge all my colleagues to vote against what has got to be one of the most ill-conceived pieces of legislation to be proposed by the Republican-controlled Congress thus far.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. If the gentleman will yield, I just want to ask the gentleman one quick question.

In my opinion, this is old politics, because the committee did not discuss at all with the authorizers, did not talk with the Secretary, did not talk to the administration. It was just a group of good old boys from the bad old days getting together against the veterans. Would the gentleman agree?

Mr. CLYBURN. Absolutely. I think that most of our friends who have been looking at the Congress operate thus far have been surprised to wake up in the morning and all of a sudden see headlines indicating that such and such is about to happen.

□ 1615

We have always tended to take these kinds of decisions through a process of hearings; people would come before the committee to talk about the pros and the cons of all of these kinds of actions. But that is not what is happening here, not in this instance and in other instances as well. There are just two or three people, or whatever number, who have gotten together and decided what they need to do in order to make it work.

As our friend from Missouri said earlier, if this were being done in order to do something about the deficit, I am convinced that the veterans in my congressional district and the veterans all across America would be lining up to do their fair share, because they too want to see us take this deficit down even further. But that is not what is being done here. We are going through a process of deciding how much money can be moved to put over in a big pot that the friends and supporters of our Republican colleagues can dip into in order to see a tax break for themselves.

So that is what is happening here as a result of that. I hope that the American people will wake up and get in touch with their Congress people before we do our veterans what I consider to be irreparable harm.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. So we have here today coming up this afternoon and tomorrow reverse Robin Hood, robbing from the poor to give to the rich.

Mr. CLYBURN. That is exactly what we have got and I think it is being kind to call it that.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I would also add that the Contract With America has turned out to be a contract on America.

Mr. CLYBURN. I think it is on Americans.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. On Americans. And this poster is a real example.

If you look at it this is a baby, and of course it does not vote. This is one of the targets of the Republican group. And who is the target now that they have added the veterans and elderly?

Everybody needs to take a close look because I think their pink slip is in the mail, too. If they are not careful they are next on the Republicans' hit list.

Mr. CLYBURN. I agree with the gentlewoman, and I think it is time for me to yield back so she may close this special order. I thank the gentlewoman so much for allowing me to be a part of this special order.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida has expired.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. I want to thank my colleagues very much for coming and sharing with the American people the plight we are in here fighting for our veterans and for other groups that are not here in the House, represented here and given an opportunity to vote.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs, I rise to urge all my colleagues to support an amendment to the rescission bill reported last Thursday by the Appropriations Committee. The amendment is modest in scope but vital to VA health care. It would restore the \$206 million for veterans programs which the Committee on Appropriations proposes to rescind.

These rescissions don't make good sense. These funds were appropriated by Congress only a few months ago, primarily to help meet a critical need to improve veterans' access to outpatient care. The six VA projects which the committee now proposes to cancel would serve areas where more than 1.2 million veterans reside.

The budget for construction of veterans medical facilities has been pretty lean for the past 5 or 6 years. As a result, the VA says it now has almost 60 projects to improve outpatient services waiting to be funded. The VA could award construction contracts on these six projects in the next several months. We shouldn't put these projects off 1 day.

These are projects that can make VA health care delivery more cost-effective. This rescission bill would slam the door on veterans across this country. In some parts of the country, the VA doesn't have health facilities that meet veterans needs. In other places, the clinics are just too small. At one clinic, space is so tight that doctors are forced to perform eye examinations in the hallways. Veterans deserve better than this.

An increasing number of veterans are women; over 1.2 million. Many VA outpatient clinics still lack privacy for women veterans. In the face of such conditions, the rescission bill is a giant step backward.

Likewise, cutting funds for replacement equipment—as proposed by the rescission measure—forces VA to choose between obtaining a needed service at increased cost through contracting or continuing to use inefficient or even obsolete equipment. The VA's medical equipment backlog is more than \$800 million. We must assure that VA care is care of high quality. Cutting back on VA funds to

replace old equipment is putting out veterans at risk.

I want to commend all of the Members who are working hard to restore these funds—the gentlewomen from Florida, Ms. BROWN and Mrs. THURMAN, the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ and the other Members who are gathered here tonight. They are all doing a good job looking out for our Nation's veterans.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 5 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 5 p.m.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. SHAYS] at 5 p.m.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal. The Journal was approved.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which those motions were entertained. Votes will be taken in the following order: H.R. 531, as amended; H.R. 694, as amended; H.R. 562, as amended; H.R. 536, as amended; and H.R. 517, all by the yeas and nays.

The Chair alerts Members of the House that the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

DESIGNATING THE GREAT WESTERN SCENIC TRAIL AS A STUDY TRAIL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 531.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and

pass the bill, H.R. 531, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 15, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 230]

YEAS—400

|              |               |                |
|--------------|---------------|----------------|
| Abercrombie  | Dickey        | Houghton       |
| Ackerman     | Dicks         | Hoyer          |
| Allard       | Dingell       | Hutchinson     |
| Andrews      | Dixon         | Hyde           |
| Archer       | Doggett       | Inglis         |
| Army         | Doolittle     | Istook         |
| Bachus       | Dornan        | Jackson-Lee    |
| Baesler      | Doyle         | Jacobs         |
| Baker (CA)   | Dreier        | Jefferson      |
| Baker (LA)   | Duncan        | Johnson (CT)   |
| Baldacci     | Dunn          | Johnson (SD)   |
| Ballenger    | Durbin        | Johnson, E. B. |
| Barcia       | Edwards       | Johnston       |
| Barr         | Ehlers        | Jones          |
| Barrett (NE) | Ehrlich       | Kanjorski      |
| Barrett (WI) | Emerson       | Kaptur         |
| Bartlett     | Engel         | Kasich         |
| Barton       | English       | Kelly          |
| Bass         | Ensign        | Kennedy (MA)   |
| Bateman      | Eshoo         | Kennedy (RI)   |
| Bellenson    | Evans         | Kennelly       |
| Bentsen      | Everett       | Kildee         |
| Bereuter     | Ewing         | Kim            |
| Berman       | Fattah        | King           |
| Bevill       | Fawell        | Kingston       |
| Bilbray      | Fazio         | Kiecicka       |
| Biltrakis    | Fields (TX)   | Klink          |
| Bishop       | Filner        | Klug           |
| Blute        | Flake         | Knollenberg    |
| Boehlert     | Flanagan      | Kolbe          |
| Boehner      | Foglietta     | LaFalce        |
| Bonilla      | Foley         | LaHood         |
| Bonior       | Forbes        | Largent        |
| Bono         | Ford          | Latham         |
| Borski       | Fowler        | LaTourette     |
| Boucher      | Fox           | Laughlin       |
| Brewster     | Frank (MA)    | Lazio          |
| Browder      | Franks (CT)   | Leach          |
| Brown (CA)   | Franks (NJ)   | Levin          |
| Brown (FL)   | Frelinghuysen | Lewis (CA)     |
| Brown (OH)   | Frisa         | Lewis (GA)     |
| Bryant (TN)  | Frost         | Lewis (KY)     |
| Bryant (TX)  | Funderburk    | Lightfoot      |
| Bunn         | Furse         | Lincoln        |
| Bunning      | Gejdenson     | Linder         |
| Burr         | Gekas         | Lipinski       |
| Burton       | Gephardt      | Livingston     |
| Buyer        | Geren         | LoBiondo       |
| Callahan     | Gibbons       | Lofgren        |
| Calvert      | Gilchrest     | Longley        |
| Camp         | Gillmor       | Lowey          |
| Canady       | Gilman        | Lucas          |
| Cardin       | Gonzalez      | Luther         |
| Castle       | Goodlatte     | Maloney        |
| Chabot       | Goodling      | Manton         |
| Chambliss    | Gordon        | Markey         |
| Chapman      | Goss          | Martinez       |
| Chenoweth    | Graham        | Martini        |
| Chrysler     | Green         | Mascara        |
| Clay         | Greenwood     | Matsui         |
| Clayton      | Gunderson     | McCarthy       |
| Clement      | Gutierrez     | McCollum       |
| Clinger      | Gutknecht     | McCrery        |
| Clyburn      | Hall (TX)     | McDade         |
| Coleman      | Hamilton      | McDermott      |
| Collins (GA) | Hancock       | McHale         |
| Collins (IL) | Hansen        | McHugh         |
| Combest      | Harman        | McInnis        |
| Condit       | Hastert       | McIntosh       |
| Conyers      | Hastings (FL) | McKeon         |
| Costello     | Hastings (WA) | McKinney       |
| Cox          | Hayes         | McNulty        |
| Coyne        | Hayworth      | Meehan         |
| Cramer       | Hefley        | Meek           |
| Crapo        | Hefner        | Menendez       |
| Creameans    | Heineman      | Metcalfe       |
| Cunningham   | Herger        | Meyers         |
| Danner       | Hillery       | Mica           |
| Davis        | Hilliard      | Miller (CA)    |
| Deal         | Hinchev       | Miller (FL)    |
| DeFazio      | Hobson        | Mineta         |
| DeLauro      | Hoekstra      | Minge          |
| DeLay        | Hoke          | Mink           |
| Dellums      | Holden        | Moakley        |
| Deutsch      | Horn          | Molinari       |
| Diaz-Balart  | Hostettler    | Mollohan       |

|               |               |             |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| Montgomery    | Richardson    | Tate        |
| Moorhead      | Riggs         | Tausin      |
| Moran         | Rivers        | Taylor (NC) |
| Morella       | Roberts       | Tejeda      |
| Murtha        | Rohrabacher   | Thomas      |
| Myers         | Ros-Lehtinen  | Thompson    |
| Myrick        | Rose          | Thornberry  |
| Nadler        | Roth          | Thornton    |
| Neal          | Roukema       | Torkildsen  |
| Nethercutt    | Roybal-Allard | Torres      |
| Neumann       | Royce         | Torrice     |
| Ney           | Rush          | Towns       |
| Norwood       | Sabo          | Trafficant  |
| Nussle        | Salmon        | Tucker      |
| Oberstar      | Sanders       | Upton       |
| Obey          | Sanford       | Velazquez   |
| Oliver        | Sawyer        | Vento       |
| Ortiz         | Saxton        | Visclosky   |
| Orton         | Schaefer      | Volkmer     |
| Owens         | Schroeder     | Vucanovich  |
| Oxley         | Schumer       | Waldholtz   |
| Packard       | Scott         | Walker      |
| Pallone       | Seastrand     | Walsh       |
| Parker        | Serrano       | Wamp        |
| Pastor        | Shadegg       | Ward        |
| Paxon         | Shaw          | Waters      |
| Payne (NJ)    | Shays         | Watt (NC)   |
| Payne (VA)    | Shuster       | Watts (OK)  |
| Pelosi        | Sisk          | Waxman      |
| Peterson (FL) | Skaggs        | Weldon (FL) |
| Peterson (MN) | Skeen         | Weldon (PA) |
| Petri         | Skelton       | Weller      |
| Pickett       | Slaughter     | White       |
| Pombo         | Smith (NJ)    | Whitfield   |
| Pomeroy       | Smith (TX)    | Wicker      |
| Porter        | Smith (WA)    | Williams    |
| Portman       | Solomon       | Wilson      |
| Poshard       | Souder        | Wise        |
| Pryce         | Spence        | Woolsey     |
| Quillen       | Spratt        | Wyden       |
| Quinn         | Stark         | Wynn        |
| Radanovich    | Stenholm      | Yates       |
| Rahall        | Stokes        | Young (AK)  |
| Ramstad       | Studds        | Young (FL)  |
| Rangel        | Stump         | Zelliff     |
| Reed          | Stupak        | Zimmer      |
| Regula        | Talent        |             |
| Reynolds      | Tanner        |             |

## NAYS—15

|             |              |               |
|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| Brownback   | Ganske       | Sensenbrenner |
| Christensen | Johnson, Sam | Stearns       |
| Coble       | Manzullo     | Stockman      |
| Cooley      | Roemer       | Taylor (MS)   |
| Crane       | Scarborough  | Tiahrt        |

## NOT VOTING—19

|              |             |            |
|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Becerra      | Farr        | Rogers     |
| Billey       | Fields (LA) | Schiff     |
| Coburn       | Gallegly    | Smith (MI) |
| Collins (MI) | Hall (OH)   | Thurman    |
| Cubin        | Hunter      | Wolf       |
| de la Garza  | Lantos      |            |
| Dooley       | Mfume       |            |

□ 1724

Messrs. BROWNBACK, COOLEY, SENSENBRENNER, TIAHRT, CHRISTENSEN, COBLE, and STOCKMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. THOMPSON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## MINOR BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS AND MISCELLANEOUS PARK AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 694, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 694, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 337, nays 83, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 231]

## YEAS—337

|              |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Abercrombie  | DeFazio        | Hinchey        |
| Ackerman     | DeLauro        | Hobson         |
| Allard       | DeLay          | Hoekstra       |
| Andrews      | Dellums        | Hoke           |
| Army         | Deutsch        | Holden         |
| Bachus       | Diaz-Balart    | Horn           |
| Baessler     | Dickey         | Houghton       |
| Baker (CA)   | Dicks          | Hoyer          |
| Baker (LA)   | Dingell        | Hunter         |
| Baldacci     | Dixon          | Hutchinson     |
| Ballenger    | Doggett        | Hyde           |
| Barcia       | Doolittle      | Istook         |
| Barr         | Dorman         | Jackson-Lee    |
| Bartlett     | Doyle          | Jacobs         |
| Bass         | Dunn           | Jefferson      |
| Bateman      | Durbin         | Johnson (CT)   |
| Beilenson    | Edwards        | Johnson (SD)   |
| Bentsen      | Ehlers         | Johnson, E. B. |
| Bereuter     | Ehrlich        | Johnston       |
| Berman       | Emerson        | Kanjorski      |
| Bevill       | Engel          | Kaptur         |
| Billbray     | English        | Kasich         |
| Billrakis    | Ensign         | Kelly          |
| Bishop       | Eshoo          | Kennedy (MA)   |
| Blute        | Evans          | Kennedy (RI)   |
| Boehler      | Fattah         | Kennelly       |
| Boehner      | Fawell         | Kildee         |
| Bonilla      | Fazio          | Kim            |
| Bontor       | Fields (LA)    | King           |
| Bono         | Fields (TX)    | Kleczka        |
| Borsari      | Filner         | Klink          |
| Boucher      | Flake          | Knollenberg    |
| Brewster     | Flanagan       | Kolbe          |
| Browder      | Foglietta      | LaFalce        |
| Brown (CA)   | Forbes         | Largent        |
| Brown (FL)   | Ford           | Latham         |
| Brown (OH)   | Fowler         | LaTourette     |
| Bryant (TX)  | Fox            | Lazio          |
| Bunning      | Frank (MA)     | Leach          |
| Burr         | Franks (CT)    | Levin          |
| Buyer        | Franks (NJ)    | Lewis (CA)     |
| Calvert      | Freltinghuysen | Lewis (GA)     |
| Canady       | Frisa          | Lightfoot      |
| Cardin       | Frost          | Lincoln        |
| Castle       | Furse          | Linder         |
| Chabot       | Gejdenson      | Lipinski       |
| Chapman      | Gephardt       | Livingston     |
| Chenoweth    | Gibbons        | LoBiondo       |
| Chrysler     | Gilchrest      | Lofgren        |
| Clay         | Gillmor        | Lowe           |
| Clayton      | Gilman         | Lucas          |
| Clement      | Gonzalez       | Luther         |
| Clinger      | Gordon         | Maloney        |
| Clyburn      | Goss           | Manton         |
| Coleman      | Green          | Markey         |
| Collins (IL) | Greenwood      | Martinez       |
| Condit       | Gunderson      | Martini        |
| Conyers      | Gutierrez      | Mascara        |
| Costello     | Hamilton       | Matsui         |
| Cox          | Hansen         | McCarthy       |
| Cramer       | Harman         | McCollum       |
| Crapo        | Hastings (FL)  | McCrery        |
| Cremeans     | Hastings (WA)  | McDade         |
| Cunningham   | Hayes          | McDermott      |
| Danner       | Hayworth       | McHale         |
| Davis        | Hefley         | McInnis        |
| Deal         | Hefner         | McIntosh       |
|              | Hergert        | McKeon         |
|              | Hilliard       | McKinney       |

|               |               |             |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| McNulty       | Quillen       | Stokes      |
| Meehan        | Quinn         | Studds      |
| Meek          | Radanovich    | Stupak      |
| Menendez      | Rahall        | Talent      |
| Meyers        | Rangel        | Tanner      |
| Mfume         | Reed          | Tauzin      |
| Mica          | Regula        | Tejeda      |
| Miller (CA)   | Reynolds      | Thomas      |
| Miller (FL)   | Richardson    | Thompson    |
| Mineta        | Riggs         | Thornton    |
| Minge         | Rivers        | Torkildsen  |
| Mink          | Roberts       | Torres      |
| Moakley       | Roemer        | Torrice     |
| Molinari      | Ros-Lehtinen  | Towns       |
| Mollohan      | Rose          | Trafficant  |
| Moorhead      | Roukema       | Tucker      |
| Moran         | Roybal-Allard | Velazquez   |
| Morella       | Rush          | Vento       |
| Murtha        | Sabo          | Visclosky   |
| Myers         | Salmom        | Volkmer     |
| Myrick        | Sanders       | Vucanovich  |
| Nadler        | Sawyer        | Waldholtz   |
| Neal          | Saxton        | Walsh       |
| Nethercutt    | Schiff        | Ward        |
| Neumann       | Schroeder     | Waters      |
| Oberstar      | Schumer       | Watt (NC)   |
| Obey          | Scott         | Waxman      |
| Oliver        | Seastrand     | Weldon (PA) |
| Ortiz         | Serrano       | Weller      |
| Orton         | Shadegg       | White       |
| Owens         | Shaw          | Wicker      |
| Oxley         | Shays         | Williams    |
| Packard       | Shuster       | Wilson      |
| Pallone       | Skaggs        | Wise        |
| Pastor        | Skeen         | Wolf        |
| Payne (NJ)    | Skelton       | Woolsey     |
| Payne (VA)    | Slaughter     | Wyden       |
| Pelosi        | Smith (NJ)    | Wynn        |
| Peterson (FL) | Smith (TX)    | Yates       |
| Peterson (MN) | Smith (WA)    | Young (AK)  |
| Petri         | Spence        | Young (FL)  |
| Pickett       | Spratt        | Zelliff     |
| Pombo         | Stark         |             |
| Pomeroy       | Stenholm      |             |
| Porter        |               |             |
| Portman       |               |             |
| Pryce         |               |             |

## NAYS—83

|              |               |               |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Archer       | Gutknecht     | Poshard       |
| Barrett (NE) | Hall (TX)     | Ramstad       |
| Barrett (WI) | Hancock       | Rohrabacher   |
| Barton       | Hastert       | Roth          |
| Brownback    | Heineman      | Royce         |
| Bryant (TN)  | Hilleary      | Sanford       |
| Burton       | Hostettler    | Scarborough   |
| Callahan     | Inglis        | Schaefer      |
| Camp         | Johnson, Sam  | Sensenbrenner |
| Chambliss    | Jones         | Sisk          |
| Christensen  | Kingston      | Solomon       |
| Coble        | Klug          | Souder        |
| Collins (GA) | LaHood        | Stearns       |
| Combest      | Laughlin      | Stockman      |
| Cooley       | Lewis (KY)    | Stump         |
| Crane        | Longley       | Tate          |
| Dreier       | Manzullo      | Taylor (MS)   |
| Duncan       | McHugh        | Taylor (NC)   |
| Everett      | Metcalfe      | Thornberry    |
| Ewing        | Montgomery    | Tiahrt        |
| Foley        | Ney           | Upton         |
| Funderburk   | Norwood       | Walker        |
| Ganske       | Nussle        | Wamp          |
| Gekas        | Parker        | Watts (OK)    |
| Geren        | Paxon         | Weldon (FL)   |
| Goodlatte    | Peterson (MN) | Whitfield     |
| Goodling     | Petri         | Zimmer        |
| Graham       | Pickett       |               |

## NOT VOTING—14

|              |             |            |
|--------------|-------------|------------|
| Becerra      | de la Garza | Lantos     |
| Billey       | Dooley      | Rogers     |
| Coburn       | Farr        | Smith (MI) |
| Collins (MI) | Gallegly    | Thurman    |
| Cubin        | Hall (OH)   |            |

□ 1736

Messrs. DUNCAN, LONGLEY, INGLIS of South Carolina, KLUG, EWING, BRYANT of Tennessee, HILLEARY, TAYLOR of North Carolina, WHITFIELD, NEY, and TATE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**WALNUT CANYON NATIONAL MONUMENT BOUNDARY MODIFICATION ACT OF 1995**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 562, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 562, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 371, nays 49, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 232]

**YEAS—371**

|              |               |               |
|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie  | Collins (IL)  | Furse         |
| Ackerman     | Combest       | Gejdenson     |
| Allard       | Condit        | Gephardt      |
| Andrews      | Conyers       | Geren         |
| Archer       | Costello      | Gibbons       |
| Armey        | Cox           | Gilchrest     |
| Bachus       | Coyne         | Gillmor       |
| Baesler      | Cramer        | Gilman        |
| Baker (CA)   | Crapo         | Gonzalez      |
| Baker (LA)   | Creameans     | Goodlatte     |
| Baldacci     | Cunningham    | Meyers        |
| Barcia       | Danner        | Gordon        |
| Barr         | Davis         | Goss          |
| Barrett (NE) | de la Garza   | Green         |
| Barrett (WI) | Deal          | Greenwood     |
| Barton       | DeFazio       | Gunderson     |
| Bass         | DeLauro       | Gutierrez     |
| Bateman      | DeLay         | Gutknecht     |
| Bellenson    | Dellums       | Hamilton      |
| Bentsen      | Deutsch       | Hansen        |
| Bereuter     | Diaz-Balart   | Harman        |
| Berman       | Dickey        | Hastings (FL) |
| Bevill       | Dicks         | Hastings (WA) |
| Bilbray      | Dingell       | Hayes         |
| Billrakis    | Dixon         | Hayworth      |
| Bishop       | Doggett       | Hefley        |
| Blute        | Doolittle     | Hefner        |
| Boehlert     | Doyle         | Henger        |
| Boehner      | Dreier        | Hilleary      |
| Bonilla      | Duncan        | Hilliard      |
| Bonior       | Dunn          | Hinchev       |
| Bono         | Durbin        | Hobson        |
| Borski       | Edwards       | Hoke          |
| Boucher      | Ehlers        | Holden        |
| Brewster     | Ehrlich       | Horn          |
| Browder      | Emerson       | Hostettler    |
| Brown (CA)   | Engel         | Houghton      |
| Brown (FL)   | English       | Hoyer         |
| Brown (OH)   | Ensign        | Hutchinson    |
| Bryant (TN)  | Eshoo         | Hyde          |
| Bryant (TX)  | Evans         | Istook        |
| Bunn         | Fattah        | Jackson-Lee   |
| Bunning      | Fawell        | Jacobs        |
| Buyer        | Fazio         | Jefferson     |
| Callahan     | Fields (LA)   | Johnson (CT)  |
| Calvert      | Fields (TX)   | Johnson (SD)  |
| Camp         | Filner        | Johnson, E.B. |
| Canady       | Flake         | Johnston      |
| Cardin       | Flanagan      | Jones         |
| Castle       | Foglietta     | Kanjorski     |
| Chabot       | Forbes        | Kaptur        |
| Chambliss    | Ford          | Kasich        |
| Chapman      | Fowler        | Kelly         |
| Chenoweth    | Fox           | Kennedy (MA)  |
| Chrysler     | Frank (MA)    | Kennedy (RI)  |
| Clay         | Franks (CT)   | Kennelly      |
| Clayton      | Franks (NJ)   | Kildee        |
| Clement      | Frelinghuysen | Kim           |
| Clinger      | Frisa         | King          |
| Clyburn      | Frost         | Kingston      |
| Coleman      | Funderburk    | Kleccka       |

|             |               |             |
|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Klink       | Neal          | Skeen       |
| Knollenberg | Nethercutt    | Skelton     |
| Kolbe       | Neumann       | Slaughter   |
| LaFalce     | Ney           | Smith (MI)  |
| LaHram      | Norwood       | Smith (NJ)  |
| LaTourette  | Oberstar      | Smith (TX)  |
| Laughlin    | Obey          | Smith (WA)  |
| Lazio       | Oliver        | Souder      |
| Leach       | Ortiz         | Spence      |
| Levin       | Orton         | Spratt      |
| Lewis (CA)  | Owens         | Stark       |
| Lewis (GA)  | Oxley         | Stenholm    |
| Lightfoot   | Packard       | Stokes      |
| Lincoln     | Pallone       | Studds      |
| Linder      | Pastor        | Stump       |
| Lipinski    | Paxon         | Stupak      |
| Livingston  | Payne (NJ)    | Talent      |
| LoBiondo    | Payne (VA)    | Tate        |
| Lofgren     | Pelosi        | Tauzin      |
| Longley     | Peterson (FL) | Taylor (NC) |
| Lowe        | Peterson (MN) | Tejeda      |
| Lucas       | Pickett       | Thomas      |
| Luther      | Pombo         | Thompson    |
| Maloney     | Pomeroy       | Thornberry  |
| Manton      | Porter        | Thornton    |
| Markey      | Portman       | Torkildsen  |
| Martinez    | Poshard       | Torres      |
| Martini     | Pryce         | Torricelli  |
| Mascara     | Quillen       | Towns       |
| Matsui      | Quinn         | Traficant   |
| McCarthy    | Radanovich    | Tucker      |
| McCollum    | Rahall        | Upton       |
| McCrery     | Rangel        | Velazquez   |
| McDade      | Reed          | Vento       |
| McDermott   | Regula        | Visclosky   |
| McHale      | Richardson    | Volkmer     |
| McInnis     | Riggs         | Waldholtz   |
| McIntosh    | Rivers        | Walsh       |
| McKeon      | Roberts       | Wamp        |
| McKinney    | Roemer        | Ward        |
| McNulty     | Rogers        | Waters      |
| Meehan      | Ros-Lehtinen  | Watt (NC)   |
| Meek        | Rose          | Watts (OK)  |
| Menendez    | Roukema       | Waxman      |
| Metcalf     | Roybal-Allard | Weldon (FL) |
| Meyers      | Rush          | Weldon (PA) |
| Mfume       | Sabo          | Weller      |
| Mica        | Salmon        | White       |
| Miller (CA) | Sanders       | Whitfield   |
| Miller (FL) | Sawyer        | Wicker      |
| Mineta      | Saxton        | Williams    |
| Minge       | Schiff        | Wilson      |
| Mink        | Schroeder     | Wise        |
| Molloy      | Schumer       | Wolf        |
| Mollohan    | Scott         | Woolsey     |
| Montgomery  | Seastrand     | Wyden       |
| Moorhead    | Serrano       | Wynn        |
| Moran       | Shadegg       | Yates       |
| Morella     | Shaw          | Young (AK)  |
| Murtha      | Shays         | Young (FL)  |
| Myers       | Shuster       | Zeliff      |
| Myrick      | Sisisky       | Zimmer      |
| Nadler      | Skaggs        |             |

**NAYS—49**

|              |            |               |
|--------------|------------|---------------|
| Ballenger    | Hall (TX)  | Ramstad       |
| Bartlett     | Hancock    | Rohrbacher    |
| Brownback    | Hastert    | Roth          |
| Burr         | Heineman   | Royce         |
| Burton       | Hoekstra   | Sanford       |
| Christensen  | Hunter     | Scarborough   |
| Coble        | Ingalls    | Schaefer      |
| Collins (GA) | Klug       | Sensenbrenner |
| Cooley       | Kohn, Sam  | Solomon       |
| Crane        | LaHood     | Stearns       |
| Dornan       | Largent    | Stockman      |
| Everett      | Lewis (KY) | Tanner        |
| Ewing        | Manzullo   | Taylor (MS)   |
| Foley        | McHugh     | Tiahrt        |
| Ganske       | Nussle     | Walker        |
| Gekas        | Parker     |               |
| Graham       | Petri      |               |

**NOT VOTING—14**

|              |           |            |
|--------------|-----------|------------|
| Becerra      | Dooley    | Molinar    |
| Bliley       | Farr      | Reynolds   |
| Coburn       | Gallegly  | Thurman    |
| Collins (MI) | Hall (OH) | Vucanovich |
| Cubin        | Lantos    |            |

**□ 1744**

Mr. LIVINGSTON changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. GRAHAM changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**□ 1745**

**COMMERCIAL VEHICLES IN THE DELAWARE WATER GAP NATIONAL RECREATION AREA**

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 536, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 536, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is, hopefully, a 5-minute vote. Members are advised there is one more vote to follow this vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 401, nays 22, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 233]

**YEAS—401**

|              |              |               |
|--------------|--------------|---------------|
| Abercrombie  | Camp         | Ehlers        |
| Ackerman     | Canady       | Ehrlich       |
| Allard       | Cardin       | Emerson       |
| Andrews      | Castle       | Engel         |
| Archer       | Chabot       | English       |
| Armey        | Chambliss    | Ensign        |
| Bachus       | Chapman      | Eshoo         |
| Baesler      | Chenoweth    | Evans         |
| Baker (CA)   | Chrysler     | Fattah        |
| Baker (LA)   | Clay         | Fawell        |
| Baldacci     | Clayton      | Fazio         |
| Balleger     | Clement      | Fields (LA)   |
| Barcia       | Clinger      | Fields (TX)   |
| Barr         | Clyburn      | Filner        |
| Barrett (NE) | Coleman      | Flake         |
| Barrett (WI) | Collins (IL) | Flanagan      |
| Bartlett     | Combest      | Foglietta     |
| Barton       | Condit       | Foley         |
| Bass         | Conyers      | Forbes        |
| Bateman      | Costello     | Ford          |
| Bellenson    | Cox          | Fowler        |
| Bentsen      | Coyne        | Fox           |
| Bereuter     | Cramer       | Frank (MA)    |
| Berman       | Crane        | Franks (CT)   |
| Bevill       | Crapo        | Franks (NJ)   |
| Bilbray      | Creameans    | Frelinghuysen |
| Billrakis    | Cunningham   | Frisa         |
| Bishop       | Danner       | Frost         |
| Blute        | Davis        | Funderburk    |
| Boehlert     | de la Garza  | Furse         |
| Boehner      | Deal         | Ganske        |
| Bonilla      | DeFazio      | Gejdenson     |
| Bonior       | DeLauro      | Gekas         |
| Bono         | DeLay        | Gephardt      |
| Borski       | Dellums      | Geren         |
| Boucher      | Deutsch      | Gibbons       |
| Brewster     | Diaz-Balart  | Gilchrest     |
| Browder      | Dickey       | Gillmor       |
| Brown (CA)   | Dicks        | Gilman        |
| Brown (FL)   | Dingell      | Gonzalez      |
| Brown (OH)   | Dixon        | Goodlatte     |
| Brownback    | Doggett      | Goodling      |
| Bryant (TN)  | Doolittle    | Gordon        |
| Bryant (TX)  | Dornan       | Goss          |
| Bunn         | Doyle        | Graham        |
| Bunning      | Dreier       | Green         |
| Burr         | Duncan       | Greenwood     |
| Burton       | Dunn         | Gunderson     |
| Buyer        | Durbin       | Gutierrez     |
| Calvert      | Edwards      | Gutknecht     |

Hamilton  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinches  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hutchinson  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E.B.  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klecicka  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
LaFalce  
LaHood  
Latham  
LaTourette  
Laughlin  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBlondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luther  
Maloney  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martinez  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCreery  
McDade

McDermott  
McHale  
McHugh  
McInnis  
McIntosh  
McKeon  
McKinney  
McNulty  
Meehan  
Meek  
Menendez  
Metcalf  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Mica  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (FL)  
Mineta  
Minge  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinar  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Murtha  
Myers  
Nadler  
Neal  
Nethercutt  
Neumann  
Ney  
Norwood  
Nussle  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens  
Oxley  
Packard  
Pallone  
Parker  
Paxon  
Payne (NJ)  
Payne (VA)  
Pelosi  
Peterson (FL)  
Peterson (MN)  
Petri  
Pombo  
Pomeroy  
Porter  
Portman  
Poshard  
Pryce  
Quillen  
Quinn  
Radanovich  
Rahall  
Ramstad  
Rangel  
Reed  
Regula  
Reynolds  
Richardson  
Riggs  
Rivers  
Roberts  
Roemer  
Rogers  
Rohrabacher  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rose  
Roth  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanders

Sanford  
Sawyer  
Saxton  
Schaefer  
Schiff  
Schroeder  
Schumer  
Scott  
Serrano  
Shadegg  
Shaw  
Shays  
Shuster  
Sisisky  
Skaggs  
Skeen  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Traffant  
Tucker  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Wamp  
Ward  
Waters  
Watt (NC)  
Watts (OK)  
Waxman  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zeliff

NAYS—22

Callahan  
Christensen  
Coble  
Collins (GA)  
Cooley  
Everett  
Ewing  
Hall (TX)

Hancock  
Hunter  
Johnson, Sam  
Largent  
Lewis (KY)  
Myrick  
Pastor  
Pickett

Roukema  
Scarborough  
Stearns  
Stockman  
Stump  
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—11

Becerra  
Billiey  
Coburn  
Collins (MI)  
Cubin  
Dooley  
Farr  
Gallegly  
Hall (OH)  
Lantos  
Thurman

□ 1756

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to prohibit the use of Highway 209 within the Delaware Gap National Recreation Area by certain commercial vehicles, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHACOAN OUTLIERS PROTECTION ACT OF 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 517.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlemen from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 517, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 7, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 234]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Allard  
Andrews  
Archer  
Army  
Bachus  
Baesler  
Baker (CA)  
Baker (LA)  
Baldacci  
Ballenger  
Barcia  
Barr  
Barrett (NE)  
Barrett (WI)  
Bartlett  
Barton  
Bass  
Bateman  
Beilenson  
Bentsen  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Billrakis  
Bishop  
Blute  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonilla  
Bonior  
Bono  
Borski  
Boucher  
Brewster  
Browder  
Brown (CA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brown (OH)  
Brownback  
Bryant (TN)  
Bryant (TX)  
Bunn  
Bunning  
Burr  
Burton  
Buyer  
Callahan  
Calvert  
Camp  
Canady  
Cardin  
Castle  
Chabot  
Chambless  
Chapman  
Chenoweth  
Christensen  
Chrysler  
Clay  
Clayton  
Clement  
Clinger  
Clyburn  
Coleman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (IL)  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Costello  
Cox  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Crane  
Crapo  
Creameans  
Cunningham  
Danner  
Davis  
de la Garza  
Deal  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DeLay  
Dellums  
Deutsch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Doggett  
Doolittle  
Dornan  
Doyle  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Dunn  
Durbin  
Edwards  
Ehlers  
Ehrlich  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Ensign  
Eshoo  
Evans  
Everett  
Fattah  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Fields (LA)  
Fields (TX)  
Filner  
Flanagan  
Foglietta  
Foley  
Forbes  
Ford  
Fowler  
Fox  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Franks (NJ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Frista

Frost  
Funderburk  
Furse  
Ganske  
Gejdenson  
Gekas  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gonzalez  
Goodlatte  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Graham  
Green  
Greenwood  
Gunderson  
Gutierrez  
Gutknecht  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hansen  
Harman  
Hastert  
Hastings (FL)  
Hastings (WA)  
Hayes  
Hayworth  
Hefley  
Hefner  
Heineman  
Herger  
Hilleary  
Hilliard  
Hinches  
Hobson  
Hoekstra  
Hoke  
Holden  
Horn  
Hostettler  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hunter  
Hyde  
Inglis  
Istook  
Jackson-Lee  
Jacobs  
Jefferson  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Johnson, Sam  
Johnston  
Jones  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur  
Kasich  
Kelly  
Kennedy (MA)  
Kennedy (RI)  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Kim  
King  
Kingston  
Klecicka  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kingston  
Klecicka  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Kolbe  
Kingston  
Klecicka  
Klink  
Klug  
Knollenberg  
Lazio  
Leach  
Levin  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (KY)  
Lightfoot  
Lincoln  
Linder  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
LoBlondo  
Lofgren  
Longley  
Lowey  
Lucas  
Luther  
Manton  
Manzullo  
Markey  
Martinez  
Martini  
Mascara  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCollum  
McCreery  
McDade  
Roukema  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce  
Rush  
Sabo  
Salmon  
Sanders  
Slaughter  
Smith (MI)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Solomon  
Souder  
Spence  
Spratt  
Stark  
Stenholm  
Stokes  
Studds  
Stupak  
Talent  
Tanner  
Tate  
Tauzin  
Taylor (MS)  
Taylor (NC)  
Tejeda  
Thomas  
Thompson  
Thornberry  
Thornton  
Tiahrt  
Torkildsen  
Torres  
Torrice  
Towns  
Traffant  
Tucker  
Upton  
Velazquez  
Vento  
Visclosky  
Volkmer  
Vucanovich  
Waldholtz  
Walker  
Walsh  
Weldon (FL)  
Weldon (PA)  
Weller  
White  
Whitfield  
Wicker  
Williams  
Wilson  
Wise  
Wolf  
Woolsey  
Wyden  
Wynn  
Yates  
Young (AK)  
Young (FL)  
Zimmer

NAYS—7

|        |             |       |
|--------|-------------|-------|
| Coble  | Ewing       | Stump |
| Cooley | Hutchinson  |       |
| Dickey | Scarborough |       |

NOT VOTING—18

|              |           |           |
|--------------|-----------|-----------|
| Becerra      | Farr      | Maloney   |
| Bliley       | Flake     | McDermott |
| Coburn       | Gallegly  | Neal      |
| Collins (MI) | Hall (OH) | Rangel    |
| Cubin        | Hancock   | Thurman   |
| Dooley       | Lantos    | Waters    |

□ 1804

Mr. HASTERT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Miss COLLINS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, due to an illness requiring hospitalization, I was unavoidably detained in Detroit today while the House was in session. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on passage of H.R. 531, "aye" on passage of H.R. 694, "aye" on passage of H.R. 562, "aye" on passage of H.R. 536, and "aye" on passage of H.R. 517.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, on March 14, I was attending the funeral of my mother-in-law and was not present for roll call Nos. 230, 231, 232, 233, and 234. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on each vote.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, due to travel delays on Tuesday, March 14, I unavoidably missed several votes. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on the passage of the following bills: H.R. 531, H.R. 694, H.R. 562, H.R. 536, and H.R. 517.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR SUNDRY COMMITTEES AND THEIR SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and their subcommittees be permitted to sit tomorrow while the House is meeting in the Committee of the Whole House under the 5-minute rule: Committee on Banking and Financial Services; Committee on Commerce; Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities; Committee on Government Reform and Oversight; Committee on House Oversight; Committee on International Relations; Committee on the Judiciary; Committee on National Security, and Committee on Resources.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority has been consulted,

and that there is no objection to these requests.

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

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am advised by the leadership that they have approved these committees meeting during legislative business, and so I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is my understanding that this includes the Government Reform Committee?

Mr. GOODLING. If the gentleman will yield, it is the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

Mr. HOYER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let me make a comment.

I understand what the leadership has done. But I want to say that there is no doubt in my mind that were the roles reversed there would be an objection.

What the Government Reform Committee, and my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] intend to do is, having had a hearing last Monday, 8 days ago, they intend to propose effectively increasing the taxes on 30,000 to 40,000 Federal employees by 12 percent by taking 2½ points off the pretax income of Federal employees as an additional contribution on their pension system. Now, that is with 8 days' notice and hearing.

Now, I hope the committee tomorrow does not take that action. I hope they give both Federal employees and the public an opportunity to look at that.

But the reason I reserve my right to object is I worked very hard with the Bush administration and OMB under President Bush for the purposes of trying to come up with an equitable system. The Hudson Institute, a conservative think-tank out of the Midwest, in 1987 gave to the Bush administration and to this Congress a recommendation that we not touch the pension plan, not touch the pension plan until such time as we had fully effected a locality-pay adjustment. The Bush administration signed legislation in 1990 to effect that over a 9-year period.

We have done 1 year of that. Notwithstanding that, we are asked for a unanimous-consent request so the committee tomorrow, after having a hearing last Monday on this issue, move ahead to make a drastic change in Federal employees' pensions.

Now, very frankly, they are going to include congressional pensions. If we cannot protect ourselves, that is tough, in my opinion. I do not care about that, I tell you, Mr. Speaker. The fact is we ought not be doing this with this short notice to Federal employees and, in effect, giving them a 12-percent, 10-percent to 12-percent, tax increase.

I reserve my right to object to make that point. Now, apparently the leadership on this side has agreed not to ob-

ject, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object, but I vigorously object to the actions that are being proposed to be taken tomorrow, and I will oppose those tomorrow. I will oppose them on the floor, and I will oppose them anywhere I can confront them. I hope to be joined by some of my friends on that side of the aisle.

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

Mr. HOYER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland. I know that he recalls that when action of this magnitude was taken in 1986, it was the result of 2 years of bipartisan effort to study the Federal retirement system, and they came up with a plan that fixed the Federal retirement system and, in fact, we are now taking in \$62.2 billion a year and paying out \$36 billion.

What is being attempted tomorrow is not an attempt to fix the retirement system. It is an attempt to accumulate \$12 billion in cuts in order to finance a tax cut for other Members on the backs of Federal employees who, in effect, would have to pay an increase, 12-percent increase, in their tax.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] withdraws his request.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 RELATING TO INDIAN EDUCATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 377) to amend a provision of part A of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, relating to Indian education, to provide a technical amendment, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania so he may explain his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to bring to the floor for consideration S. 377, legislation providing for a technical amendment to the Indian title of the Improving America's Schools Act. This legislation passed the Senate on a voice vote on February 16, 1995.

This bill, S. 377, would correct a drafting error to section 9112(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act relating to Indian education.

The intent of the House and Senate conferees was to require that a school would be eligible for an Indian Education Act formula grant if it had 20 eligible students or 25 percent of its student population eligible for the program. The provision was inadvertently drafted to replace the word "or" with "and."

The Department of Education is currently drafting regulations to implement the new provisions of the Indian Education Act. Unless this technical amendment is enacted by Congress, the existing language will result in disqualification of many schools serving American Indians and Alaska Natives, and I urge my colleagues to pass S. 377.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in support of the unanimous-consent request and in support of this technical correction.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I object to being summarily sat down by the withdrawal. There are all sorts of things you can object to, I say to my good friend, the chairman of the committee, and he is my good friend.

I ask, under my reservation, does the gentleman intend to renew, and I would ask for a notice and the comity if you are going to renew the motion; you are not going to renew it because I happen to walk off the floor. We are not going to play that way, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. GOODLING. If the gentleman will yield, that is not my responsibility to bring that to the floor nor is it my responsibility to remove it, nor is it my responsibility to bring it back again.

Mr. HOYER. Further reserving the right to object, I say to my good friend, he notices I was not looking at him at the time I said that.

Mr. GOODLING. I was merely going to say the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] seconds whatever it was you were saying in your reservation.

Mr. HOYER. I am sure the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] would join me and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] would join me and others would join me as well.

□ 1815

Mr. GOODLING. It was the gentleman's leadership that had signed off. That is why it was given to me to present.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that. So we will have some further discussions before it is moved ahead?

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend give me the assurance that this unanimous-consent request will not be renewed until such time as I have signed off on it?

Mr. GOODLING. If your leadership comes to us, I suppose we can give you some assurance.

Mr. HOYER. I take it that is a no.

Mr. GOODLING. I am not in a position to respond to the gentleman's request.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 377

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

**SECTION 1. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.**

Section 9112(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as added by section 101 of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-382)) is amended by striking "and" and inserting "or".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 377, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

**SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF**

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 39) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Federal disaster relief, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Missouri to explain the request that is now before us.

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

Mr. Speaker, as Members know, we will soon consider fiscal year 1995 budget rescissions to pay for \$5.36 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations for last year's Northridge, CA, earthquake. Combined with the \$8.6 billion we appropriated last year, the cost to the Federal Government alone from

this tragic disaster will be almost \$14 billion. It has now been reported as of yesterday that an additional \$2 billion in damages have occurred, with that number growing daily.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to offer this resolution expressing the sense of the Congress to address the serious issue of reforming our Federal disaster policy, and I outline a number of measures that should be taken to reform our Federal disaster policy.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman for his fine explanation and I comment him for bringing this important issue before the House.

Everyone is familiar with our recent legacy of natural disasters. Hugo, Andrew, Iniki, Loma Prieta, Northridge. The names alone are sufficient to conjure images of death and destruction. But experts tell us that these are but a prelude to future events which could be even more catastrophic. Whether it be Missouri or Tennessee or Washington State or California, the point is that natural disasters are going to happen and it is our responsibility as homeowners, Government leaders, and as businessmen and women, to prepare for them.

To do that, a new partnership is urgently needed, so that more of the disaster relief burden can be borne by insurance and less by the Federal Government. That is what this resolution urges us to do, and that is the cornerstone of H.R. 2873, the Natural Disaster Protection Partnership Act, which I proposed in the last Congress.

That bill was the subject of hearings and wide-ranging discussions among homeowners, consumer groups, the insurance industry, realtors, labor unions, firefighters, and countless others.

What began as a modest proposal became, in the eyes of more than 160 of our colleagues, the nexus for solving the crisis facing millions of Americans affected by the likelihood of a natural disaster touching their lives.

Last September, the Public Works and Transportation Committee—which I had the privilege to chair—approved H.R. 2873 without opposition. We knew we couldn't get the bill enacted into law so close to the end of that Congress, but we also knew that we had to begin to force the issue and chip away at the apathy which says that we can worry about this crisis some other time. We can't.

This country simply must begin to stop the fear of what may come tomorrow, and we do that by forging a consensus where none has been possible in the past. That consensus is becoming possible because of the nature of the partnership proposed in H.R. 2873.

The partnership would lower the cost of coverage for natural disasters such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, and windstorms by spreading the financial

risks and requiring that coverage in all policies.

We would enable homeowners to continue to rely on private insurance by creating two new funding backstops to cover the cost of claims which a State insurance pool or private insurance company could not cover on its own.

The first backstop would be a private, nongovernmental corporation. The corporation would become a reinsurance pool to be tapped into when either an insurance company or a State has reached the limits of its financial resources.

The second backstop would be a new Federal Disaster Trust Fund. This trust fund would provide short-term loans if the reinsurance pool is temporarily depleted.

And since we are talking about Federal loans, it is important to remember that this partnership would not increase the Federal deficit; the bill requires that the Treasury be reimbursed, with interest, after the crisis ends.

But more than these backstops, we would take actions up front, such as requiring States to adopt one of several model building codes, and the enforcement to go with it. What we all saw in Florida after Hurricane Andrew, for example, was a code which had not been enforced—and roofs that flew around the citrus State like flies in an orange grove. In other words, there must be a partnership in preventive medicine before disaster strikes as well as in financial surgery after the fact.

A bipartisan House Task Force on Natural Disasters—cochaired by the gentleman from Missouri whom, again, I want to commend for bringing vision and leadership to that effort—endorsed many of the principles embodied in H.R. 2873 when it issued its report last year.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, what was a Democratic leadership agenda in the 103d Congress is now Republican in the 104th. Legislation dealing with the Contract With America has preoccupied the House in these first 100 days.

Given this, the task force report in December, the reality of scores of new Members, the legislative schedule, and my own desire to tackle as many disaster insurance-related problems as possible in my legislation, I decided not to simply reintroduce the same bill that my committee approved last fall.

Working with the gentleman from Missouri, we are now looking at issues ranging from unfunded mandates to commercial losses.

Our goal is to get the legislation as right and as complete as possible so that we can do even better than the 162 cosponsors from last year, and quicken the pace from the time the bill is introduced to the time the House approves it.

I expect that the new legislation will be about 90 percent or more of what we

reported last year, and that the bill will be ready in a few weeks.

House Concurrent Resolution 39, which I cosponsor, supports that effort. If it is the most we can do at this time to address the issue of preparing for natural disasters; it is the very least we must do.

As the resolution states, “\* \* \* a fundamental overhaul of Federal disaster policies should be undertaken to reduce costs to taxpayers and encourage more effective partnerships between private sector and government at all levels in anticipation of future catastrophes.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I just wish to take this time to thank the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] for his leadership in this subject area, both in the last Congress as the chairman of the then Public Works and Transportation Committee and for his leadership in this Congress as the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and also the role that he played, most constructively, in the Bipartisan Task Force on Natural Disasters, which rendered, I think, a very fine bipartisan set of recommendations that will be transformed into legislative language using the gentleman's bill from the last Congress as a base. I hope, together with the gentleman, to move forward very expeditiously in this Congress with passage of this much needed legislation.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 39

Whereas catastrophic natural disasters are occurring with greater frequency, a trend that is likely to continue for several decades according to prominent scientists;

Whereas the Federal Government has responded to disasters by appropriating relief funds, which provide only short-term assistance to victims but long-term burdens to taxpayers; and

Whereas the increasing reliance on Federal disaster relief has overshadowed the need to perform more comprehensive disaster planning and rely on private insurance for protection against disaster risks: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—*

(1) persons who live in areas at high risk to natural disasters should assume more responsibility for their actions by insuring against such risks in order to minimize the rising cost of Federal disaster relief;

(2) sensible, cost-effective disaster mitigation programs should be encouraged and enhanced at the State and local level;

(3) insurers should create a privately funded pooling mechanism for the spreading of

disaster risk in order to encourage the continued availability and affordability of private insurance in all parts of the Nation; and

(4) a fundamental overhaul of Federal disaster policies should be undertaken to reduce costs to tax-payers and encourage more effective partnerships between the private sector and government at all levels in anticipation of future catastrophes.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 39; the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

#### HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

#### AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR CIRCUS ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of the current resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 34—authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus anniversary commemoration, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development, for an explanation of his request.

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for a brief performance of the Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus on or about April 3, 1995. This event is intended to be a salute to the 104th Congress and a celebration of

the 125th anniversary of the Ringling Brothers Circus. This event promises to be a welcomed diversion for Members, their families, staff, and the general public, and will be free of charge. It will feature traditional circus entertainment, complete with recorded music.

Ringling Brothers will assume all expenses and liabilities in connection with this event, which will be presented under conditions prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board. These officials are currently meeting to discuss the details of this event.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's explanation, and I too support this resolution. The circus provides family entertainment for millions of Americans and families, and we are pleased to be able to be a part of this annual event and bring it to the Capitol Grounds for this salute to the 104th Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

#### H. CON. RES. 34

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus celebrates its 125th year on April 10, 1995, during its engagement in our Nation's Capital;

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus represents a 200-year tradition of circus in America;

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus demonstrates to children of all ages that humans and animals can work together in harmony and cooperation; and

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus is committed to its goal of educating the people of the United States as to the need to conserve endangered species: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

#### SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR RINGLING BROS. AND BARNUM & BAILEY CIRCUS ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION.

Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as "Ringling Bros.") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, with circus elephants and performers, on the Capitol Grounds on April 3, 1995, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate may jointly designate.

#### SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that Ringling Bros. shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

#### SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, Ringling Bros. is authorized to erect upon the

Capitol grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

#### SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

#### SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON REPRESENTATIONS.

Ringling Bros. shall not represent, either directly or indirectly, that this resolution or any activity carried out under this resolution in any way constitutes approval or endorsement by the Federal Government of Ringling Bros. or any product or service offered by Ringling Bros.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to consider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. 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 adopted.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority side will still yet have a unanimous-consent request to make, and if we go into the special orders, will that be too late for them to do so? I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is checking on that now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that normally business requests are not entertained once special orders have begun.

□ 1830

#### RENEWAL OF REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and subcommittees be able to sit during the 5-minute rule tomorrow:

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Committee on Commerce, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, Committee on House Oversight, Committee on International Relations, Committee on the Judiciary, Committee on National Security, and Committee on Resources.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, as I was saying when this matter was previously brought up, I am not going to object, but I do want to make the point, and I think it is a point that bears consideration.

This is a very serious matter that is going to be considered by the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight tomorrow. It is a matter of great controversy. Now we have considered a lot of matters of great controversy when we have been under the 5-minute rule. My side has agreed to this, and I am not going to object because of that. The leadership on my side has consulted with their leadership and has agreed.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to make the point under my reservation that this is a change of great magnitude for middle-income workers, that we expect to carry out our policies. The proposal is approximately a 10-percent tax increase. Now, if it were on any other people in America, the committee would not only not meet, they would be vigorously opposed to such an action. I am told that the proposal will be changed somewhat and that, in fact, the money will not be a savings, but will be applied to the retirement itself of Federal employees. But it has been projected at an \$11 to \$12 billion cut out of the pension benefits of some 2 million civilian Federal employees. That is a big hit on Federal employees. I am opposing that proposal, and will oppose it tomorrow, and am hopeful that it will not be approved.

Now the ranking member of the subcommittee from which that came is the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN]. He has raised many reasons why it should not be approved, and at this time, under my reservation of objection, I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

The reason why we have reserved the right to object is that we are marking up a bill that has been given very little consideration. The minority had been notified only days in advance of a markup and, in fact, of hearings. We are rushing to judgment on a retirement system that, in fact, does not need tampering with, that, in fact, was

fixed in 1986 after 2 full years of deliberation, and now we are going to change that within a matter of days with very little reflection.

Most of the Members of this House have no idea what we will be marking up tomorrow and bringing to the floor very shortly. What we did in a bipartisan way, after 2 years of study in 1986, was to institute a new retirement system. That retirement system is working perfectly. It is fully funded. The old retirement system is not fully funded, but in fact it is being phased out. So there is no reason to mess with that, and, when we passed legislation in 1986, we told Federal employees, we told our colleagues, we told the American public, we were not going to change this system, and now we are asking for unanimous consent to mark up a bill that completely changes it in a radical and punitive manner.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we did this in 1986. Was the gentleman here in 1986?

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I was not here, and the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] was not here.

I would tell the gentleman from San Diego and I would emphasize that we have a responsibility to maintain the contracts that we make with the American people, that this Congress does. We are standing in the seat and assuming the responsibilities of our predecessors, and, when the U.S. Congress makes contractual obligations, it is our responsibility to fulfill those obligations. I am glad that the gentleman from California made that point, made the point that we have a responsibility to fulfill our commitments, and we are going to abdicate that responsibility and violate that commitment in the markup tomorrow. At least that is the intent of getting unanimous consent to be able to meet during the legislative session. That is why we have brought up this reservation.

Granted, it applies to Members of Congress; that is not the reason for the objection. Members of Congress will pay more into their retirement, and they will get much less back out of their retirement. But the people that are taking the biggest hit are Federal employees who will pay almost a 12-percent tax increase in the CSRS plan. It will go from 7 to 9½ percent and, in the new plan, from 0.8 to 3.3 percent after we assured them this would not happen.

That is why this should be objected to, and I yield back to the gentleman who yielded to me, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER].

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] asked the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN]

whether he was here. He, of course, perhaps knew, or at least may have known, that the gentleman from Virginia was not here.

As the gentleman well knows, I was here, and I would tell my friend from California that this was a bill that was passed by the Democrat House, by the Republican Senate, and signed by President Reagan. This was an attempt to put, as my friend from Virginia has said, the pension system on a sound basis. As the gentleman from California clearly knows, President Reagan, his OPM director, OMB and the Republicans in the U.S. Senate, then headed by Mr. DOLE, as he is now heading that Senate, as the gentleman knows, made a determination that it needed to be changed, so we created the FERS system, which is for new employees and new Members of Congress, and we kept in place the Civil Service Retirement System. As the gentleman from Virginia has pointed out, that was a bipartisan fix of a pension system.

It created two systems, a new system, and left in place the old system. It did not deal, as I know my friend knows, with the military retirement system, and I would presume that my friend would not want us to arbitrarily and capriciously, with very short consideration, change the military retirement system, and the reason we should not do that is we have a moral obligation to our friends who served in the military, who served their country, and under one consideration, they did not do it for this reason, but we told our friends in the military, "This is the deal, this is the pension system that we're going to give you," and I am going to yield to the gentleman in just a second, but I was intrigued with my friend's question, so I wanted to fully respond.

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

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I agree, and I do not disagree totally with what the gentleman is doing. My only intent was the gentleman was sounding like he helped create the bill. He, nor I, was there, and that is the only issue I brought.

Mr. HOYER. The gentleman makes a point, neither of them were there.

The point I want to make in all seriousness, and we are almost ready, but, further reserving my right to object, the point I want to make is that this is a very serious proposal which will adversely affect middle-class working Americans, and I have a lot of good friends on their side of the aisle with whom I agree some of the time, but very frankly this is not a partisan issue in terms of those who are being focused on it. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS], the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], and, as the gentleman mentioned, others share

our concerns that we not in a short term, without serious consideration, without extended debate in the subcommittee or in full committee, without an opportunity for persons to be heard who will be adversely affected, impose on middle-class working Americans in effect a 10- to 12-percent tax increase.

Now we do it by increasing their pension from 7 to 9½ points. That is a 2½ point—about \$750—\$750 on the average Federal worker, and that is akin to about a 10-percent tax increase. That is something we ought not to do in the fashion that we are doing it. That is the purpose of us rising.

Mr. Speaker, we are not going to object because there has been an agreement, and very frankly we understand, even if we objected, they could make a motion tomorrow to do the same thing, and I am convinced they would prevail, but I hope we look at this matter very closely. My friend from California said he may agree with me if we affected military retirement in this fashion. We would not want to do that. I say to my colleagues, don't do it to civil service employees any more than you would do it to military personnel in this fashion.

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

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, just as the gentleman from Pennsylvania who asked unanimous consent request, I ask that the Members of Congress realize what this means to them or, more importantly, to their staffs, in fact to all the committees' staffs, all the people who work up here on the Hill. They will see their retirement contribution requirement increased by about 12 percent, from 8 to 9½ percent. On the base that is about a 12-percent increase. They will see their accumulated retirement reduced by 2 percent. So we hit them on the front end in terms of what they contribute and on the back end in terms of what they are able to accumulate toward their retirement, but when we compare that to Federal employees, there was actually a 35-percent increase. That is 2½ percent over the current base of 7 percent, a 35-percent increase over what they are currently paying, plus there will be a reduction in what they are able to receive.

And in the Thrift Savings Plan, which was designed to fix this, which we were committed to sustaining and to not changing, there will be a reduction in the employer contribution, the Federal Government's contribution, from 5 down to 3 percent. This will affect the quality of life of everyone in the Federal Government who is dependent upon a Federal retirement, whether it is in the legislative branch, or the executive branch, or the judiciary branch.

This is a profound change in the assumptions that people have made when

they seek and obtain Federal employment and when they plan their retirement years, and yet we get unanimous consent to mark up a bill with a few days' notice, and bring it to the floor and make such a profound change with very little consideration.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and just in closing:

We ought to remember approximately 90 percent of private sector employees in America make no contribution to their retirement systems, none. Federal employees are now making a 7-percent contribution. Now, the Federal employee pension system is a better system than most private sector pension systems. I mentioned that Ronald Reagan signed the bill in which we formed this working with a Republican Senate and a Democrat House.

□ 1845

In 1990, A Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, working with a Republican President, George Bush, tried to reform and did reform the pay system. And the reason President Bush and his administration agreed to that was because they believed, correctly, that pay was not comparable, and they further believed that you ought not to modify in any way the pension system until you got pay comparable.

President Bush then signed the locality bill, the Federal Comparability Pay Act, and said in signing that that he hoped to put the pay and retirement system on a solid base. That is our point. We ought to retain what we have. We ought not to change it and we ought not to do it in this way.

But, again, as I said, Mr. Speaker, I will not object because of the fact that my leadership has agreed to this process.

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

There was no objection.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

#### THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUR WELFARE SYSTEM

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

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, next week the House will take up an historic piece of legislation, the welfare reform bill. There has been a lot of discussion about spending on welfare in the context of that bill and there is going to be a special order later this evening which will discuss that further.

I want to talk just for a few minutes not about spending as such, but about the relationship between spending on welfare and the effectiveness of our welfare system. And I am going to do that first by looking at this graph, which is very informative. It shows us how welfare spending has grown since the Great Society programs were announced in the mid-1960's.

What you can see from that, Mr. Speaker, is that in approximately 1965 we were spending about \$30 billion in Federal and State spending on welfare. And that by 1992, we were spending close to \$300 billion on welfare, or a tenfold increase in how much we were spending on welfare. So we had an explosion in welfare spending on the Federal and State level in the last 30 years.

But look, Mr. Speaker, at what has happened to the poverty rate during that period of time. In 1948, it began a steep decline, down to about 15 percent in approximately 1965, at the same time as welfare spending has exploded and it has stayed the same. It has gone up slightly since 1965.

This vast explosion of welfare spending has brought us not a decrease in poverty but, in fact, a slight increase in poverty and we are entitled to say, why? Why at the same time as we have increased, exponentially, spending on antipoverty programs has poverty stayed the same when it was declining beforehand?

The reason is because of the incentives in the welfare system. The welfare system pays this money only on the condition that people have a child without being married, earlier than they probably otherwise would, and without having a job.

So what the welfare system is doing is destroying work and marriage and family and responsibility. And if you destroy that, it does not matter how much money the Government gives somebody, you are not going to get people out of poverty. It is like bailing water out of a boat with one hand while you are pouring water in with the other.

I want to go to the other chart. I only have a few minutes. This is a projection of what is going to happen with welfare spending in the future.

Now, this is a baseline before the welfare reform bill that we are working with that we will be debating next week. You will see that welfare spending is projected to go up from \$300 billion in 1992 to close to \$520 billion by 1998. By that time, it will be almost twice what we spend on defense.

Now, the CBO numbers are not out, Mr. Speaker, so I did not put it on here. The Republican welfare bill we are going to debate allows welfare spending to go up about half that much by the rate of inflation.

And I want to close with a couple of comments. In the first place, nobody in

Washington is talking about cuts in welfare. The bill we will debate next week will allow welfare to grow at approximately the rate of inflation. If you hear anybody talking about cuts in welfare, they are either very much mistaken or they are simply uttering something that is not true.

The second point that these two graphs graphically show is how much we are spending on welfare is a lot less important than how we spend it, because values are more important than money. What we have been doing in the past is spending money on welfare in a way that has destroyed families and destroyed work. And so we have gotten not only not less poverty, but more poverty.

What is exciting about our bill is that for the first time we begin spending money on welfare in a way that reinforces family and work and personal responsibility, and that will make a difference for the people caught up in the system.

We take a step for the first time toward ending cash benefits at least for teen moms. We are going to give that money to the States and localities so they can take care of those moms in a way that reinforces family and work instead of destroying it.

And not only are we going to stop punishing people for working, which is what the current system does, we are going to start requiring work so that by the end of the decade about 50 percent of the people on the welfare caseload, and that is an honest number, will have to work in order to get their welfare benefits.

I am going to close, Mr. Speaker, with an observation that my friend Mr. WATTS, our distinguished colleague from Oklahoma, often makes. Under the current system we have always measured the success of welfare by how many people we could get on food stamps and AFDC and medicaid and the 70-odd other Federal welfare programs. We measured success by how many people we could get on welfare; by how much money we could spend on welfare. We need to stop doing that because welfare is not a life of dignity and hope for anybody.

We need to start measuring success, and we are going to start measuring success, by how many people we get off of welfare, off the AFDC, off of food stamps, off of medicaid, and into a life of dignity and hope and self-sufficiency which is the American dream. That is what we are offering to people.

Mr. Speaker, that is what we are going to be debating next week.

#### WE OWE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE REAL WELFARE REFORM

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

Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the 104th Congress has been keeping its promises. From real crime legislation to giving much-needed reform to Federal regulations, we are indeed keeping our promises.

One of our promises to America has been to reform the welfare system. We are going to have the opportunity to change the welfare system within the next few weeks. I would like to share my thoughts with you on where welfare has been and where I would like to see it go.

For over two years, the current administration has promised to end welfare as we know it. For over two years, hard-working taxpayers have been waiting and waiting and waiting. Now, this Congress is going to begin that much-needed reform.

The current welfare system has been a tragic failure. It has encouraged dependency upon government, discouraged responsibility, and cost taxpayers hundreds of billions of dollars.

Part of the welfare reform process involves the food stamp reform. That the food stamp delivery system must be reformed, there can be no question. Currently there is an estimated \$2 billion of fraud and abuse involved in the food stamp program annually.

The people of the 7th district of Tennessee who I represent are sick and tired of hearing about such widespread misuse of the food stamp program. They are demanding change and they deserve it.

The Food Stamp Program and Commodity Distribution Act will fight this abuse. It contains stricter penalties for food stamp trafficking, tough fines and forfeiture of ill-gotten gains. It is time we crack down harder on those who abuse food stamps and H.R. 1135 will do just that.

I have always believed that the States are better able to operate the food stamp program. After all, the States are on the frontline, much more so than we here in Washington. Pending legislation will give the States the option and the opportunity to take their food stamp funding in the form of a block grant. It is my hope that the States choose this option. It is the most effective and efficient way of reform.

Another important part of this legislation involves work requirements. It is neither right nor fair for those of us who choose to be responsible, tax-paying citizens to pay the way for someone who chooses to make no effort to be productive. So I don't think it is unreasonable to require someone to work for their benefits. H.R. 1135 does that.

Mr. Speaker, we owe the American people real welfare reform. The pending legislation will begin to provide that reform. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1135 as we begin considering it in the near future.

#### THE EMPLOYEE COMMUTE OPTION

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

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, the issue I want to speak about tonight involves a mandate imposed by Congress which must be enforced by the EPA. It is a plan that affects many of my constituents in the 16th congressional district of Illinois and many businesses in several cities across the country.

Many governors have called this the most unreasonable, least thought-out, least effective but very, very costly program ever proposed by the U.S. Congress. The plan, employer trip reduction, was mandated under the Clean Air Act amendments of 1990.

Let me explain what this mandate is all about. Section 182(d)(1)(B) of the Clean Air Act requires employers of 100 or more employees in severe and extreme ozone nonattainment areas to increase passenger occupancy per vehicle in commuting trips between home and the workplace during peak travel periods by not less than 25 percent. The idea is to have people find some other mode of transportation to and from work other than using their car.

The misnomer applied to this mandate is the Employee Commute Option. Some option. If the State elects not to implement this mandate, it stands to lose some of its transportation funds. In Illinois that is \$700 million. In Pennsylvania, it is \$900 million. In some States, fines levied against businesses that do not participate may range into the thousands of dollars.

Areas across the country that face this mandate include Baltimore, New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Houston, Milwaukee, Los Angeles, San Diego, Ventura County and Orange County in California. Other affected States include Connecticut, Delaware, New Jersey, and Indiana.

The EPA, in implementing guidelines for this Employee Commute Option, suggests other options for getting to work including mass transit, jogging, bicycle riding, car pooling, and walking.

Well, in the 16th congressional district of Illinois there is a rural county, McHenry County, which is included in the Chicago consolidated statistical metropolitan area. That means residents in and around McHenry County who work in this rural area without sidewalks or mass transit system must car pool. This is a federally mandated car pooling and it is an outrage.

When the amendments of the Clean Air Act were passed in 1990, I was not a Member of this body, and to the best of my knowledge there was never any formal debate on this issue in the House; never any specific hearings on the issue before it was simply slipped in to the Clean Air Act amendments.

This past Sunday, Illinois Governor Edgar and I took the bold and coura-

geous step of announcing a moratorium on the federally mandated employee commute option. He has directed the Illinois Department of Transportation not to enforce this measure. Why? An assistant administrator for the EPA admitted that air emissions reductions are, quote, "minuscule," and her agency has stated it simply does not intend to enforce the mandate.

This moratorium now puts Illinois in the same situation as Pennsylvania and Texas which have announced that they will not participate in enforcing the mandate. There is only one catch, Mr. Speaker: the employee trip reduction mandate is the law. The EPA may choose to not enforce it. The States may not enforce it. However, there is nothing to keep a Federal judge from enforcing it.

No, the mandate is clear. It is law. It says that businesses with over 100 employees shall participate and decrease the number of cars going to and from work. This will cost up to \$210 million per year to enforce this unfunded mandate and that applies not only to the private business business but to the public sector.

This law is so ridiculous that it says to a high school that has more than 100 teachers and administrators, that those teachers have to car pool. But the students do not have to car pool, so we would have the incredible result of teachers walking to work, having to hitchhike there to be picked up by their students. And students would rather go to school without their teachers so that they will not have to be taught the subject for the first hour. It is crazy. It is insane. But that is how ridiculous this mandate is.

Data from Southern California indicates that forced car pooling costs companies over \$100 per employee and \$3,000 per vehicle taken off the road. And the EPA itself has estimated the tremendous cost into the billions of dollars annually to address a solution which itself calls minuscule.

□ 1900

I have introduced H.R. 325 to return the true meaning to the word "option." It makes the employer trip reduction mandate optional to the affected states. H.R. 325 is dedicated solely to correcting this single provision in the Clean Air Act. Nothing else. It does not decrease the quality of the air. This bill simply makes car pooling an option to reach the goal of clean air. This is not an environmental or anti-environmental bill. It simply makes car pooling voluntary in the menu of options available to achieve clean air standards.

This is why this bill has such wide support. It is bipartisan, has more than 152 cosponsors, and I would encourage my colleagues to become cosponsors with us.

### SCHOOL NUTRITION AND FAMILY PROGRAMS

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side insist upon trying to tell the country that a cut is not a cut. But the problem with their calculations are as we talk to more and more local school districts, they clearly realize that these are cuts. The School districts and school nutrition programs will have less money over the next 5 years to feed children than they have under the current services budget by CBO that will allow them to continue to serve the number of children that they are serving now.

Monroe County schools up near Rochester, NY, they are talking about serving 7,800 fewer children than they would otherwise be able to serve in the coming year. The point is this, that when you look at the cuts in school lunch programs, you see that the Republican proposal is off by some \$2.3 billion. They can say this is not a cut, but the fact is it is a cut, because those children who would otherwise be served in this program over the next 5 years, many of them simply are not going to be able to be served.

If they choose to serve every child, they have to decide to cut back on the meal and nutrition component of that meal, and as we know from many of these children, this is where they get a good portion of their nutrition in the entire day. They can decide to raise the price to those who are now paying a reduced price meal. The fact is when we have seen that, a good portion of the reduced price young people are forced to drop out of the program because they simply do not have in their family income sufficient money to increase that price. They can choose to throw all of the paying children out of the program who pay full price for the meal, but as we know, when you do that, you start to lose the economics of the program and programs close down as a result of that.

So what we have here is a mismatch of about \$7 billion in nutrition programs over what we should be spending to serve this population as opposed to what the Republicans are offering in the welfare reform bill under the child nutrition components. They say that they are offering \$4.5 billion every year, and that is supposed to make everybody here believe that that in fact takes care of the problem. But the problem is that the 4.5 percent they are offering every year is not based upon the total cost of what it costs to deliver school lunches and pay for them under the current program, because it does not include the cost of the commodities, so that is excluded from the 4.5 percent. The cost of education is ex-

cluded from the 4.5 percent, and in fact they omit almost 20 percent of the funds currently used to provide nutrition programs for our young people, and that is why the 4.5 percent then, even though they add it every year, falls further and further behind, until by the 5th year, we see there is a gap in the nutrition component of my Republican colleagues of a little over \$7 billion. That is roughly in the school lunch component because of 2 million children over the next 5 years that otherwise would be served under the current services budget as opposed to those who will not be served.

Now, the Republicans also want to convince everybody in America that they are not cutting meals, they are only cutting the bureaucracy. The bureaucracy at the Federal level for all nutrition programs is \$140 million a year. \$140 million a year. If you do it over the 5 years, it is roughly \$700 million. They are cutting \$7 billion out of the program. So obviously it is not just the bureaucracy.

The cuts go far beyond the bureaucracy at the Federal level. Where do the cuts go? They go right to the school lunches, to the participation in the WIC program, to the school breakfast programs, to the nutrition education programs that are sponsored by this program.

What does that mean? That means a good many of our poor and our near-poor, the working poor in this country who rely on this program for nutrition, simply will no longer be able to do so to the same extent that they are today.

They are not talking about waste, fraud, and abuse. We had those problems many years ago when the private sector thought it was open season on the school lunch program and they could deliver substandard meals and poorly packaged meals and stale meals and charge us. We are not talking about that in the WIC program, when we had the problems of being ripped off by some of the largest food companies in this country that thought they could sell us substandard formula or sell it to us at rates that far exceed the going rate.

Unfortunately, in the Republicans' proposal, they no longer include the competitive bid process, which would save us a billion dollars, and we were using that money to plow back into providing the services for pregnant women and newborn infants. So the bottom line is that a cut is a cut. There is a \$7 billion gap between this and whatever.

I ask my colleagues, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM is on the Armed Services Committee, if someone said they were only reducing the growth of the defense budget, I suspect they would call it a cut. That is what they have been calling it over the last several years whenever it is suggested is that a cut take place or a reduction in the growth. But

if you are a hungry child, the \$7 billion gap that you create means that lunches will not be delivered, and that is the simple fact. The numbers cannot be denied. I assume that is why they are so frantically trying to convince people all is well in the school lunch program. It is not, and it is not well for the children.

### FAMILY AND SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, my Republican colleagues and I are here tonight to set the record straight about family and school nutrition programs. We care about women, infants and children, and are committed to compassionate solutions to assist our children.

I believe that the whole debate on this issue was best summarized in an editorial which appeared recently in the Cincinnati Enquirer. The author poses the following question to us: If you had a dollar to spend on lunch, would you rather, A, give it to Uncle Sam, who will order your lunch for a cut of the money, or, B, choose your own lunch, or, C, skip lunch and stay hungry?

We have a program that chooses A, give your money to Uncle Sam, who will order your lunch for a cut of the money. President Clinton and his Congressional allies would have you believe that any change in the current system would mean choice C, that kids would go hungry.

Nothing could be further from the truth. My colleagues and I believe we should choose B, to give block grants to the States and allow decisions to be made closer to our children, which empowers families and our local communities.

We are growing kids, not the Government. Our plan will increase funding for Women, Infants and Children programs and school nutrition programs by 4.5% each year. As you see from this chart in each year from 1995 to the year 2000, the red chart shows a yearly increase of the food programs for school nutrition of 4.5 percent and an even larger increase for WIC programs.

The GOP growth in school meals is very clear, the huge increase. You see the increases, 3.6 percent, 4.5 percent, and 4.5 percent. The same is true with WIC programs. I wish to point that out. The GOP also grows the WIC programs. In this case we see that a line goes up, the CBO baseline WIC funding and the GOP WIC funding, which is even higher.

By eliminating the Federal middleman and the 15-percent administrative costs that were used to run the current

program, our plan will make more resources available to feed more children.

Our proposal creates two separate block grants—one to address family nutrition needs and one to address school nutrition needs, which preserves the family and rewards work.

The family nutrition block grant will allow States to promote the good nutrition, health and development of women, infants and children and to provide healthy meals in child care, head start, summer camp, and homeless shelters.

Under the block grant, funding for family programs, including vital programs to help women, infants, and children, will be \$588 million greater over the next 5 years than in the current programs. With increased funding and less bureaucracy and paperwork, States can assist more of our children.

The school nutrition block grant allows our schools to provide breakfast, lunch, before and after school meals and low-cost milk to our children. We know that hungry children cannot learn—that is why we propose to increase funding for school meals 4.5 percent each year for 5 years. We are sensitive to the needs of our children. We are committed to providing healthy meals and thus creating a proper learning environment.

Furthermore, the school nutrition block grant will enable more meals to be served to more children.

We are proud to be part of a caring solution that helps our children grow, not our Government bureaucracy.

#### SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, last week President Clinton visited Patrick Henry Elementary School in Alexandria, VA, to have a bite to eat. He dined on federally subsidized beef tacos and coleslaw and corn and fruit. The point of his visit was to try to convince the American people that the Personal Responsibility Act would slash the money that funds the current school lunch programs. Frankly, that is a lot of suckatash.

The President and those who oppose welfare reform are not telling the truth to the American people. The Personal Responsibility Act would direct that money to go where it is most needed, away from the Washington bureaucrats and toward low income children. The idea is to help those who have the greatest need.

I apologize for injecting real facts into this otherwise lively debate, but let us look at the numbers. In 1994, the Federal appropriation for the school lunch program was \$4.3 billion. The Personal Responsibility Act would al-

locate block grants to the States of \$6.7 billion next year, rising to \$7.8 billion in the year 2000.

So funding for school lunch programs will increase by 4.5 percent each year over the next 5 years. Let me repeat that again. School lunch programs will increase by 4.5 percent each year. Now, people can argue about whether that is good or bad public policy, but, please, do not mislead the public by calling it a cut.

There has never been a time during this debate when those of us who favor welfare reform have voted for decreasing spending for school lunch programs. Our intent is to better serve children, not the Washington bureaucrats.

How does this bill work? We will transfer power away from the Federal food bureaucrats in Washington and give more authority to the States where it belongs. At the same time, we will focus the program more efficiently to ensure that at least 80 percent of the money goes to children from low income families.

States will have the flexibility to use the grant funds to support what they find to be the best programs for their individual school districts. They can decide how to meet the needs of children and families in their areas. This plan makes school nutrition programs easier to operate and more cost-effective by reducing paperwork. It caps administrative costs at 2 percent, and it helps ensure that meals are appealing to children by allowing greater choice at the regional and local level. We are not cutting funds for our children; we are eliminating the Federal bureaucrat as the middleman.

Federally funded beef tacos may be what we have become accustomed to, but the diet we have become accustomed to here in Washington is not necessarily healthy for the American people. The States should have the opportunity to see if they can feed more children more efficiently with more money. That is what we propose to do.

Frankly, as a parent myself, it makes a lot more sense to me for someone to be able to talk directly with his or her local school board about school lunches than it does to have to speak to the Agriculture Department or Committee on Agriculture here in Washington. It is not as though Federal overmanagement makes beef tacos, coleslaw, corn and fruit taste better.

I hope that those who are so wedded to the present system finally will begin to tell the truth to the American people. The debate becomes clearer when it is understood all the distortions and false accusations are coming from people who understand that we are not proposing state school lunch cuts, but they want to avoid the real cuts other unrelated programs later on.

But opponents want to preserve the country's huge welfare state, so they

launch this fear attack now as a preemptive strike. Well, my view is while we need nutritious lunches in our schools, we need a whole lot less baloney here in Washington.

□ 1915

#### REFORMING THE WELFARE SYSTEM AND FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GUTKNECHT] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, one of my favorite Presidents was Ronald Reagan, and two of my favorite expressions that he used, and some Members will remember in some of the debates, he would use the phrase, "Well, there you go again."

He used that expression when people would attempt to distort the facts. We have heard it again tonight. "Well, there you go again."

One of my other favorite expressions from President Reagan was one that I use often around my office, and, that is, "Facts are stubborn things." I almost wish we could bring those charts back here so people could continue to look at them because I think facts are stubborn things, and I think the more the American people get a chance to see the real facts about what we are talking about relative to welfare reform and reform of our nutrition programs, the more that they will see that the facts are on our side and that this is not a plan designed to cut the nutrition program. As a matter of fact, some of my more conservative constituents back in the district are saying, "Why are you allowing these programs to grow the way you are? We'd like to see you freeze these programs."

We are being accused by some of our Democratic colleagues of being mean-spirited and we are hurting children. But I was reminded of a quote the other day from Ralph Waldo Emerson. He said, "There is always a certain meanness in the argument of conservatism, joined with a certain superiority in its facts."

As we show the facts and as the American people get to know the facts, I think they will recognize that when we are talking about meanness and particularly as it relates to our children, I think the meanest thing we can do to our kids is leave them a debt which they will not be able to pay off. That is exactly what we are doing, ladies and gentleman.

Last year the President's own budget officers backed up by the General Accounting Office said that unless we make some changes, by the time today's kids reach our age, they may be confronted with an 82-percent tax rate. In fact, we are stealing from their future. I think the American people are

way out in front of us. I think they expect some real cuts. As a matter of fact, all of my town meetings have centered around cut spending first. Frankly, I think some of my constituents are upset because we have taken so many things off the table. As I said earlier, I think they want real cuts in welfare, they want real cuts in some of these programs, and in fact as you look at the charts, whether you are looking at welfare, the Nutrition Program, the WIC Program, all of the other programs, we are actually seeing significant increases.

We have only been here about 9 weeks but it is interesting to me to learn the vocabulary of Washington. Here an increase can be called a cut. But we look at the numbers, and the numbers speak for themselves.

If we look at the Family Nutrition Block Grant Program. According to the current programs, we would be spending in fiscal year 1996, \$3.585 billion this year. Fiscal year 1996. Under the Republican plan, we are going to spend for the Family Nutrition Block Grant Programs \$3.684 billion. That is not a cut. The American people know that is not a cut, and I think the American people want cuts.

I want to close, Mr. Speaker, if I could with a quote, and I will not tell who said this because I think it is such an important message, but I would like to share this with the body:

The government has extremely limited resources to address the many and urgent needs of our people. We are very keen that this real situation should be communicated to the people as a whole. All of us, especially the leadership of political organizations in civil society, must rid ourselves of the wrong notion that government has a big bag full of money. The government does not have such riches.

The speaker went on to say:

It is important that we rid ourselves of the culture of entitlement which leads to the expectation that the government must promptly deliver whatever it is that we demand and results in some people refusing to meet their obligations.

That was not NEWT GINGRICH who said that, it was not even Thomas Jefferson who said that. That was said less than a month ago by Nelson Mandela, addressing some people in the Democratic Parliament in Cape Town, South Africa.

Let me just repeat that last sentence because I think it is so important and I think that is what this debate is all about. Are we willing to finally ride ourselves of this entitlement attitude that we have?

He said:

It is important that we ride ourselves of the culture of entitlement which leads to the expectation that the government must promptly deliver whatever it is we demand and result in some people refusing to meet their obligations.

Mr. Speaker, this exercise that we are going through, whether we are

talking about the nutrition programs or welfare reform, is really about changing the attitude not only of Washington but of the American people. We cannot go on under this principle that people are not responsible for themselves. Our welfare reform is really about reinforcing some of those principles, some of those values, if you will, that we know work. We need to reemphasize work, we need to reemphasize personal responsibility. That is what this exercise is about. The facts, the numbers are on our side. Frankly I think, Mr. Speaker, the American people are on our side.

#### FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans say that really they are not cutting nutrition programs, and I do not intend to suggest that they mean to cut and suggest they are not cutting.

We are probably looking at this in different ways. I would think that the emphasis ought to be placed on will they serve more children in the long run or will they serve less? Is the current policy being enforced or will they indeed have a new policy which may yield more money but serve less people?

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that wedding oneself to entitlement certainly is not wedding oneself to invest in our future. Wedding oneself to entitlement is not the same as saying children are our most precious commodity. And entitlements as to some of the basic necessities as food and shelter and health seems to be consistent with what democracy is all about, not necessarily wedding them to be on the dole. I would argue for consistency in terms of America and reaching out to help those least among us as reaching out to help those who are most affluent. It was indeed President Kennedy who said, and I agree, that if this Nation cannot respond to the many who are poor, certainly this Nation cannot defend the few who are rich. That is true, Mr. Speaker.

What are those myths they are saying? They are saying, well, there is going to be more food indeed for school lunches.

I would submit, indeed they are cutting. In fact, the chart we have here indicates surely that they are cutting as a whole.

They say indeed that what we are doing, we are increasing the School Lunch Program 4.5 percent. Indeed, that may be so, but consider this, Mr. Speaker. In that 4.5 percent, you are not taking into consideration inflation, you are not taking into consideration the increase of students who will be

there, but yet that same approach was not led to the defense. Indeed, you did take into consideration when you were looking at the budget for defense that in order to maintain that level of service, we have to make an adjustment for inflation. But indeed you did not do that.

When you take all of the nutrition programs together, this chart clearly shows that over that 5-year period, there would be cuts of at least \$7 billion. You see, when you take all the many nutrition programs together and begin to block grant them into two, something else happens to that, particularly the ones that you have the nutrition where you have WIC and other programs. You begin to have the programs who are in need competing among themselves. How does that affect the American people?

I will tell you, it certainly affects the day care people and those who are working because they are going to find that their day care is going to go up and beyond, to make work affordable, they are going to have to increase their outlay for day care because now the choices will be how much money we spend on WIC, how much money we spend on day care.

You say, well, 80 percent of those funds are designed for WIC. Well, WIC does not want to help people get over the first 2 or 3 years and find that the mother is now working and all of a sudden her day care is going up because you are pulling away the support that you had there before day care.

Block grant in itself may not be an evil concept but block grant under the guise of efficiency and better service and local control, it needs to be examined. I submit to Members that in the block grants, in cutting, we may indeed be offering an unfunded mandate because those people who are closest to their citizens will be going to their county commissions, be going to their State general assembly, because they have come to understand that these programs are there and they no longer will be there. You will say, we have given the block grant and we have capped them.

The other issue about block grants is that it does not indeed take into consideration the downturn of the economy. It makes no adjustment for that whatsoever.

Given these factors, it cannot be made substantial when we go beyond the rhetoric that more children will be served. The truth is, more children will not be served. Why? Food is going up, and the school and population is growing.

Which of us would rather tell the last 5 kids of the 25 that are there that they are not going to be able to be served? You must begin to understand why people are so outraged is they cannot believe that you understand this and will still go forward. It is not that we think

anyone has more of a disregard for young people than we are, but apparently we do not share the same vision for the future to allow this to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all of us to begin to think not in terms of entitlement when we think of our children but think of our children as our future. To the extent we fail to invest in our future, we fail to invest in our society.

#### MORE ON FEDERAL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the preceding speaker joining us in the well, the gentlewoman from North Carolina. I appreciate her point of view and especially her last couple of comments. However, I thought for a time tonight we had made real progress because it seemed the preceding speaker, Mr. Speaker, had decided to back away from the terminology "cut."

Let us again state for the record, the proposal offered by your new majority in the Congress of the United States, a proposal that for child nutritional programs adds \$200 million over what President Clinton outlines in his budget, a plan that calls for annual increases over the next 5 years of 4.5 percent every single year, friends, those are increases.

The numbers, with all due respect, offered by the opposition are phantom numbers because they speak of \$7 billion in cuts, \$7 billion that don't even exist.

The problem, Mr. Speaker, is this: We do confront a deficit of stark proportions for us all. In fact, by some estimates since in essence the national debt is compounded every nanosecond, it continues to grow, by some estimates we confront a national debt that affects every man, woman, and child in this country to the tune of their share in the national debt, for you and me and for everyone else, fast approaching \$20,000.

We have a simple choice: Either we can continue to play the tired old politics of the past which are akin to a schoolyard game of am-not-are-too, am-not-are-too, or we can face this serious problem and take a look and decide to rein in the growth of spending to what is reasonable, to what is rational, and, yes, taking into account the inflation rate, what is most effective, and that is behind our notion of changing these grants to block grants, to let those on the frontline fight the battle.

It is true there is a very real difference in philosophy here, because those in the new majority, Mr. Speaker, believe that people on the frontlines can best fight this battle and believe it is not incumbent upon a bu-

reaucracy run amok in Washington, DC, to decide how best to spend money.

□ 1930

Your new majority in this Congress realizes that what might work in Philadelphia might not work in Phoenix and that people on the frontlines in the States of Pennsylvania and Arizona and North Carolina and across this Union can best decide how to fight the battle.

But again, the programs are not being cut. Really, this begs a larger question, and one I think of stark importance to our Republic. Do we face the challenge now and deal with it responsibly, or do we remain wedded to the politics of the past?

We heard with great fanfare my friend on the other side from California just repeat all the arguments and all the incendiary rhetoric. Let me submit to you that if we fail to deal with this problem, if we continue with the same old name calling, the false numbers, in essence those who are wedded to the past, those who are the guardians of the past have become, in essence, the enemies of the future. For in maintaining a tired old broken-down welfare state, they have, in essence, declared war on the next generation of Americans.

All we ask is this, Mr. Speaker: That we in this body in which it is a great honor to serve, that we do what every American family at one time or another has to do, Mr. Speaker, to gather around the kitchen table and make some hard choices.

Can good people disagree? Yes. Good people can disagree. And certainly there is a difference in philosophy that I delineated.

But I would challenge the other side to come forward with positive programs to tell us where the cuts will come, to tell us where the changes will come, instead of trotting out the tired old rhetoric of the past.

The stakes are too high. The future beckons us.

#### IN THE FRONTLINES WITH THE WIC PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who preceded me in the well talked about the frontlines. I do not know where he was yesterday, but I was at the frontlines. I went and visited a WIC program in Springfield, my hometown in Springfield, OR.

Apparently the gentleman is quite unfamiliar with the programs. They are run by local boards. In fact, the chairman of the board of our local WIC program is a Republican lawyer who a couple of years ago thought about running against me. So there is an incred-

ible amount of discretion and weight given to local control.

What did I not see at the WIC program yesterday? I did not see this: I did not see a low-birthweight baby who was suffering tremendously and who was going to be an extraordinary expense all paid for out of the other pocket of the taxpayers, by Medicaid. I did not see one of these yesterday.

But what I did see were a bunch of healthy kids and some parents coming from a whole bunch of different circumstances. I want to talk just a little bit about that.

I saw a teen mom yesterday, a category of recipient who would be cut off from benefits in the Ozzie and Harriet world of the other side of the aisle. We should not have teenage pregnancies, and, by God, if they have them, they are not going to get any benefits.

What is going to happen to the baby in that world? You want to punish the teenager. What about the baby? I do not even think you should be punishing the teenager. A little counseling is a little more in order. I met a teen mom, and she had gotten some of that counseling at that WIC program. Counseling is one of the things cut off under the Republican block-grant proposal. You will give them the food vouchers still, but you will not get the nutrition counseling. They taught her how to breast feed her little baby, and they were there yesterday, and they were a testimony to how well this program works.

I saw a working mom with two kids. She is working, a single parent, but she qualified for the WIC program, and you know what, her kids had nutritional problems. They both had a problem with dairy. They had dairy sensitivity. She did not know how to deal with it. She did not have the wherewithal to deal with it. She went to the WIC program, and got nutrition counseling. She got a diet. I saw those two kids yesterday. They are beautiful kids. They are thriving now through the WIC program.

They talk a lot about fraud and abuse. There are no allegations of fraud and abuse in the WIC program. People get vouchers for a healthy diet.

You know, there are allegations, substantial allegations, in the food stamp program. What is very interesting is the Republicans originally proposed to block grant the food stamp program. But you know what, they backed off, not because they did not want to get at the \$3 billion of fraud and abuse. I believe they want to get at that as much as I do and the organized crime. But because Safeway and A&P and Stop and Shop and all the farm lobby came in and said, "You can't do that to us."

Now, WIC unfortunately, the Women, Infants, and Children's Program, low-birthweight babies, the nursing moms, they do not have those kinds of lobbyists, the same kind of lobbyists

Safeway has or the agriculture groups have.

So food stamps is back on with ineffective measures to deal with the \$3 billion of fraud and abuse, but WIC is on the chopping block. It is going into a block grant program about 80 percent of the funding it gets now, and 20 percent of that money can be diverted by the Governor of any State to any other purpose they want. And they tell me, "Don't worry, the WIC program won't be hurt." Well, there is an unmet need in my hometown of Springfield, OR, and I know there are unmet needs in many other towns across America, and the WIC program is one of the most cost-effective ways of meeting that need.

I met another gentleman, a man, who was there with his baby. He and his wife, both college graduates, both employed, but in the current job market they are not making a lot of money; they are having a little trouble making ends meet. They are new parents. They qualified for the WIC program. They are getting nutritional supplements for their baby, and they have learned a lot about parenting through this program.

I met another woman there whose child had had a routine pinprick blood test. They do that to the kids who come into the program to see if they have any deficiencies. They discovered that that child had childhood leukemia, and the child is now in treatment.

But this program in their world will not be required to exist anymore because of all of the Federal bureaucrats mandating so many things. I was there yesterday. I did not see any Federal bureaucrats. I saw a bunch of healthy, happy kids. I saw a bunch of parents who were doing better and getting just a little bit of help, and most everybody there was working. Funny thing, given the current minimum wage; and how well do you think you can provide for a family of four? That is why we have the Women, Infants, Children Program.

What does one low-birthweight baby cost, both in terms of trauma to the parents, both in terms of developmental disabilities for that child, both in terms of cost to the Medicaid program? Is it too much to ask that we continue the Women, Infants, Children's feeding program and prevent those low-birthweight babies? I do not think so. And I think America can afford that.

#### CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, once again, I think we have to make the facts known, especially in light of the last speaker. We are not cutting this program. We are increasing this program.

Here are the charts. Now, that chart is a hypothetical, what if, and I guess I

could say that in an expenditure where we would hypothetically have \$20 billion or \$30 billion to care for some type of children's program, I could say we should have \$60 billion to care for it, so we have really shortened and short-changed that program. That is what this chart is. That is exactly what this chart is.

The fact remains we are increasing it. Something I am going to agree about with the last speaker about a successful program. Yesterday I was in Zanesville, OH, Muskingum County, Mr. Speaker, and the people that run the WIC program were in, and it is a successful program, and it is a good program, and I believe that we have recognized that time and time again. We are recognizing it again and again and again by saying we believe in it and we are going to increase it, and here is the chart that tells we are going to do it.

So we have not said it is a bad program. We have no question of the effectiveness of the program. We have no question how it has helped people.

But I have got to tell you, they call this the well. They ought to rename it the swamp, because I think we get to a low point when we come in and bring a picture in and try to say that by increasing this we are going to do harm to children. I think that is absolutely ridiculous.

Let us state the facts as they are, and the fact is that it has been a good program. The fact is that the new way to do the WIC program does not take away counseling, as the last speaker told you, Mr. Speaker. It does not, because nothing changes in this program.

The question of where are we going to live up to the food standards, we do, Mr. Speaker, live up to the food standards, because that is also taken care of through this program.

But it is a bigger picture, and the bottom line in this country, Mr. Speaker, is that tomorrow morning everyone in this country looks into the mirror and sees the face of the human being that is morally responsible as to whether our children live in a country that is safe, prosperous, and secure.

So we all have to ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, as we look into our faces in the mirror, Members of Congress and people throughout this country, are we doing the best job to make sure that this country is safe, prosperous, and secure for our children? And I answer we are. But not just in how we revise this program to take the Federal bureaucratic end of it out, but in the overall picture of what we are also doing is stepping up to the plate and balancing this Nation's budget, of trying to reempower families to help them by reempowering them to make decisions, and this is what it is all about. It is a bigger picture.

Because what we have done in this country by letting Washington remain

the same old, same old, time after time, is we have let a bureaucracy build up, and as I told people from the WIC organization yesterday, we have let it build up to the point if we do not take control now of this deficit, if we do not take back control and reempower families out in the heartland, Mr. Speaker, in this country, we are not going to have to worry about charts on either side of this aisle, because there is not going to be anything left. We will have nothing to leave our children. When we look in the mirror, we are going to know we did not leave our children with a safe country. We did not leave our children in prosperity. And we did not leave, Mr. Speaker, our children with peace.

So not only are we doing the right thing, not only are we increasing this, we are also looking at a bigger overall picture to restabilize this government, to reempower where it counts, in the hands of the citizenry, Mr. Speaker.

And with that, I think we have just got to stay to the facts and quit using scare tactics from this side of the swamp, not the well, to use this type of scare tactic. We should speak to the reality of what we are trying to do, to make a better America, and that is what we are. We are sending our message, Mr. Speaker, to you tonight and to our colleagues, and we know that if we work together in the bigger picture, we are going to give back to families their dignity and give back to families their ability to help empower themselves for a better future.

#### CAN THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SOLVE THE PROBLEMS OF AMERICA?

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

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask a series of questions and to make some statements, and the first question is: Can the Federal Government solve the problems of America? You know, I asked that question as I campaigned for the last 4 years.

I really believe the average person out there in this country does not think for a minute that the Federal Government is going to solve the problems that we have in this country, and there is a tremendous amount of misinformation and disinformation.

I returned to Washington today from Chattanooga, TN, my home, and I can tell you from being there this weekend that this issue has outraged so many people who know better and know that there is some untruth being told. The words "cutting" and "eliminating" are being used over and over again on editorial pages all across this country. It has gotten so out of hand that small children are writing letters to Members of Congress, I am sure at the instruction of their teachers or maybe even

their parents, saying, "Mr. Congressman, please, don't cut my lunches. Please, don't eliminate the food from my table."

□ 1945

And another question I have tonight is, who is actually taking advantage of children here? When you ask small children who don't know any better to write a letter to their Congressman with the threat that you are going to take food off of their plate in front of them and they are not explaining to these children what the truth is.

You know block grants is what we are talking about. Decentralization is what we are talking about. It is a recognition that things are not working, things have not been working. Federal Government got too big, too powerful, out of control. It is outrageous, and we are trying to block grant these dollars back to the State and the local governments.

You know, Al Harris runs the Chattanooga housing authority in my home city, and does an outstanding job there. They are concerned. Let me tell you what he says about block grants. He says block grants work. He says, "Send the money down, unleash the shackles. We got too many rules, too many regulations, too much bureaucracy. Send us the money. We can produce." He looks at this as a good thing, as decentralizing the Federal Government and sending the money on down.

I heard in church Sunday morning a teacher in Hamilton County, Tennessee, said, We have got problems with school lunch programs. Those people who are in need are not getting the services because people who do not qualify are abusing the system. People are applying for and receiving free lunches in our schools and they drive up in about BMW's to let their kids off in the morning. You know why that happens? Because this is a big Federal bureaucracy micromanaged out of Washington, DC, and every time we have turned these programs over to the Federal Government they have got out of hand. Fraud sets in and money is wasted and people do without.

In about 2 weeks, this House, I believe this majority, will vote to put \$500 in the pocket of every child in this country whose parents are working and paying taxes. That is the kind of child relief—that is the kind of child support that we need to be engaged in, and there is more help on the way. We are sending this money back to the States. We are not cutting or eliminating anything, and my colleagues have said that over and over again.

What I think this really boils down to is whether or not we trust our State and our local governments, because I do not believe the liberals in this country will acknowledge that our States and our local governments have done a

better job than we have done up here in Congress for the last 30 years.

You know, they are balancing their budgets at home. They are responsible. They have got their priorities in order. They are not about to go out and borrow money with a credit card like these voting cards here. The worst and most expensive credit card in the history of the world here is the credit card that Members of Congress use to vote in this Chamber, moneys that they do not have, and it is out of hand. We have got to do something about it.

So let us send the money back to the responsible governments, the State and the local governments. I know in my home State that our governor and our State legislature is going to do the right thing with these moneys when we block grant them back there, and if your program is good, you will get more money, not less money, through block grants and then you won't have the Federal Government breathing down your throat on everything.

I want to close with a statement I know you have heard before but we need to remember it right now, 1995, while this country is at risk. A government big enough to give you everything you want is a government big enough to take from you everything you have.

Patriotic, freedom-loving Americans need to recognize that our Federal Government is out of control. We have got more government than our Founding Fathers ever wanted. We have got more government on a Federal level, more micromanagement, more bureaucrats, more waste, fraud and abuse than I ever wanted to deal with, and we are up here trying to do something about it and they are not telling the truth.

Now, if we are going to have a legitimate dialog in this country about what is best for our children and our future, let us at least be honest. We are not running campaigns anymore. That comes up next year. You know, we knew when we got into it you would not tell the truth about us in our campaigns. That is part of campaigning. This is lawmaking. This is serious business.

Let us at least tell the country the truth on this issue of block grants because this is the beginning of downsizing the Federal Government, returning the power and the money to the States that have acted responsibly.

#### THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM

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

Mr. WHITFIELD. Mr. Speaker, when the school lunch program was started back in 1946, the research that I have done indicates that the program cost about \$70 million that year, and the

projections indicate that by the year 2000 the food programs in the United States will be approaching \$7 billion.

Now, when you talk about hunger in America, I want to emphasize this evening that those of us on this side of the aisle are just as concerned about the welfare of children throughout America as those people on the other side of the aisle. They certainly do not have any sole discretion about and concern for the needs of children around this country.

But when you have a program, and I might also add that in addition to this school lunch program, there are thousands of programs out there to provide help to American citizens, and that is part of the problem, because you cannot solve a \$4.7 trillion deficit problem in America without coming up with new approaches and new solutions to very difficult problems.

Now, all of us would like to do everything that we can do to eliminate hunger in this country. We would like to eliminate disease in this country. We would like to eliminate child abuse completely in this country. All of us agree to that. But we have a significant problem. How do we continue to provide the money for all of the thousands of programs out there, whether they are child care programs, breakfast programs, lunch programs, after school programs, child abuse programs, or whatever they may be?

So the challenge that we have is to come up with innovative solutions to provide the maximum benefit for children throughout America at the lowest cost, and that is what this block grant does that we are now proposing.

We are trying to send this money back to the State and say, bureaucrats in Washington are not close to the problem. The people in the State may be more innovative. Some governors around this State have shown in the last 10 years that they can come up with innovative programs to make a real difference in saving dollars and providing more benefits for the recipients, and that is what we are looking for in this block grant on this school lunch program.

Now, many speakers have already indicated today that our program provides 4.5 percent more nationally for this program each year over the next few years. But I want to, as we have talked about this program in very general ways, we have not been specific enough on how the program really works. And I want to take a moment this afternoon to talk about that.

First of all, in a school lunch program in America today, there are three basic programs. First of all, there are those children who receive free lunches, free breakfast and free snacks, and they receive it because they are somewhere between 135 percent and 185 percent of the poverty level, and they should receive free food because they

are not going to get a nutritious meal anywhere else and our program is going to see to it that they continue to receive it.

Then the second group of students, in my home State of Kentucky, the average meal at lunch time on the school lunch program costs \$1.60 approximately. And this second group, they pay 40 cents for that lunch.

Now, the Federal Government each month writes the local school board or school nutrition program a check. For those students who paid zero for their lunch, the Federal Government writes a check for \$1.60 for every meal served, and by the way, 25 million meals are served around this country everyday. And for those students who paid 40 cents, the government writes a check each month for \$1.20 to the local school program.

Now, there is another group of students and those are students who belong to their parents, may be doctors, may be lawyers, may be businessmen, coal operators, coal miners, but they can afford to pay for their lunch and they pay \$1.20, still 40 cents below the cost of the lunch. And then on top of this—the Federal Government writing a check for the balance between 40 cents and \$1.20, we also sent an additional 17 cents for all meals served.

So all I am saying is that we can provide a program where the wealthy children in this country pay their full share and we can benefit more poorer children, provide better nourishment, more nutrition, and I think that the entire country will benefit from this innovative approach to the school lunch program.

#### BLOCK GRANTING THE SCHOOL-BASED NUTRITION PROGRAMS

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

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I had to participate in this particular debate because it has grated on me, quite honestly, as a member of the House Appropriations Committee and a member of the Economic and Educational Opportunities Committee. I see a couple of my colleagues here, Mr. GOODLING, the chairman of the full committee, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of the subcommittee chairmen, and it has grated on me to hear these repeated falsehoods and exaggerated claims coming from the other side of the aisle.

It has also reminded me of that wonderful statement that there are really three kinds of lies. There is lies, there is more lies, and there is damn lies, and we have been hearing an awful lot of damn lies and out and out falsehoods propagated by our friends on the Democratic side of the aisle regarding our plans with respect to block granting the school-based nutrition programs

back to State and local education agencies and our plans to dramatically overhaul and reform the American welfare system.

Now, I am a former school board member. In a sense, that is how I cut my political teeth, because believe me, school boards remind one of the old saying of I think the late Speaker Tip O'Neill, that all politics are local, and I have a great deal of confidence and faith in those men and women who come forward, purely in a volunteer capacity, to serve on the school boards of their local communities.

I am fully confident that they will provide for the nutritional needs of our school kids at the local level and that is obviously the best way for government to function.

Now, we believe that block granting the school lunch and breakfast programs, obviously, as this chart indicates that my colleagues have made repeated reference to tonight during special orders, we believe that our block grant programs to State and local education agencies obviously does not mean the end of nutrition assistance to needy children. Instead, what it means is the end of funding to Federal bureaucrats.

Some facts to go with the chart as we have attempted to reinforce tonight with our colleagues, and also to the American citizens who might be viewing these proceedings, some facts. Number one, funding in the nutrition block grant will increase 4.5 percent per year, as the chart indicates.

Number two, at least 80 percent of the funds must be spent on low-income children, that is to say, the neediest of children in local schools around the country.

And number three, not more than 2 percent of the block grant funds can be spent on administrative expenses at the State government level, ensuring that more funds are spent on nutrition services for children.

And, ladies and gentlemen, let me just stress that this is part of an overall approach by Republicans in re-inventing and downsizing the Federal Government. We are attempting to respond to this patchwork that we have today of over 600 separate Federal categorical programs that have been authorized by past Congresses over a period of many years, and as a consequence, we are putting forward proposals to radically reform this current maze of congressionally mandated government human service programs.

We are considering proposals that we will be bringing to the House floor in coming weeks to consolidate block grant programs in the areas of education, job training, nutrition, child care, and welfare.

And why the block grant approach? Well, the obvious reason. This is a fundamental and long overdue reform necessary back in Washington because

these Federal categorical programs are too proscriptive. They are overregulated. They are incredibly fragmented. As my colleagues on the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities will attest, when you are talking about 153 federally mandated job training programs for adult and youth, we are obviously talking about government gone amuck and creating far too many programs that can be reasonably administered for productive results and actual benefits to recipients.

So these programs are fragmented and many times often duplicative with the programs at the State and even local government level. We think block granting will actually encourage flexibility, local control, innovation, and ultimately greater accountability.

And why are we taking this approach? Because we want, by cutting down on Federal bureaucracy here in Washington, to apply those cost savings to reducing the deficit and ultimately balancing the Federal budget, as we have promised our fellow Americans we will do by the year 2002.

The only way we can do that is to decentralize authority and responsibility, and, yes, funding and revenues back to the States. In turn, we will be dispersing power to our fellow citizens and will be empowering those Americans who are most in need of government services and encouraging them to take greater responsibility for their own lives and their own destinies.

I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker and colleagues, I wish the President and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle here cared enough about our children to balance the budget. I want to say that one more time. I wish our Democratic colleagues cared enough about our children to balance the budget. That is simply not the case.

In conclusion, we believe that we have a moral imperative to balance the budget, and that is exactly what we intend to do by taking these innovative approaches here despite the opposition.

□ 2000

#### THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM AND BASIC MATHEMATICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY] has got a Ph.D. in economics, and the Dick Armeley formula for basic math says, "If you increase spending by more dollars the following year than you have spent on it in the current year, that's an increase. If you spend less dollars the next year, that's a decrease." That is Dick Armeley basic math. I would offer a book called "Basic Mathematics" for my colleagues on the other side because I am the subcommittee chairman

that went through the process, and we sat and figured out what is the best way to improve programs that work good, but yet we can still improve them.

Mr. Speaker, I had a Democratic page come up to me and say, "Mr. CUNNINGHAM, we see the rhetoric on this issue. I'm a Democrat, but why are my own Representatives lying about the facts over and over again?"

We are adding dollars to the children's nutrition programs. What we are cutting is Federal bureaucracy, and the Clinton Democrats will do anything they can to protect those bureaucracies.

Is the school based program, the children based program and family based program; are they fairly effective? Yes, they have been worked on with bipartisanship by my chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and Mr. FORD who was his predecessor. And have they worked in the past? and do they work presently? Yes, but, if we can remove the mounds and mounds of paperwork, the Federal reporting that we have to go through every day. And back here in Washington we have got those Federal bureaucrats that have got to receive all those reports and justify their existence with those reports.

Mr. Speaker, that is what the Democrats will fight to do, anything they can in their power to spend and be re-elected.

Let us take a look at what President Clinton projected in the 1995 budget. He projected a 3.1 percent increase. We are increasing it by 4.5. If I was a Democrat, I would say, "Well, President Clinton is cutting children's nutrition." He did not cut it; he increased it by 3.1 percent, and in the budget that he just spoke right up here, Mr. Speaker, in your chair, and announced to the American public, he justified a 3.6 percent increase, not a 4.5 like we did, but a 3.6 percent increase.

And again we could say, "Well, the President is cutting children's nutrition." He did not. But what we are doing is taking a look at how we can make it more effective. Republicans believe that government works best that is closest to the people.

I spoke yesterday to seven of probably the most liberal school superintendents in existence from Los Angeles, from San Francisco, from San Diego, and Oakland, and Fresno, and do my colleagues know what they said? "DUKE, we not only want you to block grant it, we want you to get the money to us directly in the LEAs so we can use it in the local school district, so we can disburse it and cut out the State bureaucracies, let alone the Federal rules and regulations. We want to get it to our kids, and, when we've got only 23 cents out of every buck that gets down to the local school district, something is wrong. There is too many bu-

reaucracies, too many regulations, too many reports."

Mr. Speaker, that is what my colleagues on the other side will protest, and let me tell you something we did do in this committee.

In California we have 400,000 illegal immigrants, children, K through 12, 400,000. That is 800,000 meals per day to illegal kids. That is over a billion dollars a day. At \$5,000 each to educate those children, that is \$2 billion a year, and they want to feed kids.

Do we want to feed all the kids of the world? Yes. But do we want to do it at the expense of American citizens and American kids? The answer is no on our side of the aisle. We cannot afford to feed the world. We want to feed American kids and make sure that the dollars get down to the people, and we are increasing those funds, not decreasing those funds. We are eliminating bureaucracies, not increasing bureaucracies and making it much more effective to do that.

Now in practicality are schools going to go in and eliminate those kids? No, they are not.

#### TIMBER SALVAGE

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, this week the House will take up consideration of the emergency timber salvage sales amendment. This is an amendment designed to make use of timber that would otherwise be left to rot in the forest. The Forest Service estimates that over 20 billion board feet of dead, dying, and downed timber is now in the forests of America.

I am going to tell my colleagues the story of just one tree, one of thousands in western Washington alone. This tree, and many others like it, blew down on the Olympic Peninsula. This is not an uncommon occurrence on the Washington State coast. While this tree grew in a region that is perfect for its growth, the unique combination of heavy rainfall, wet soils, and frequent high winds cause trees like this giant 500 year old Douglas fir to blow down. Thousands of these blown down trees are rotting on the forest floor right now. This tree had the chance to be different. Mr. Jim Carlson can be seen in this picture. He tried to purchase this tree from the Forest Service to be cut up in his sawmill, which used to employ about 100 people. The Quinalt Ranger District refused to sell this tree to him. Mr. Carlson then came back to the Forest Service and asked that he be sold this tree and two other downed trees for use in construction of an interpretive building that he wished to construct at his ranch as part of an economic diversification project. This would have allowed Mr. Carlson to get

into the tourism business, which, if we had put him out of the sawmill business, is the least we could do for him. The request was denied in spite of the fact that a provision for this type of sale was contained in the Grays Harbor Federal Sustained Yield Unit Agreement.

The taxpayers are the big losers in this story, though. This tree would have produced approximately 21,000 board feet of lumber. To put this in a better perspective, 800 board feet equals one cord. The sale of this tree by the Federal Government to Mr. Carlson would have brought the taxpayer between \$10,000 and \$20,000 for that one tree. Mr. Carlson would have been able to sell lumber from this tree for approximately \$60,000 at retail rates. Conservatively this would be enough lumber to build two modest homes.

The sad end to this tree came in a perfectly legal, though terribly wasteful, manner. An out-of-work timber worker, armed with a firewood permit, cut up this grand old giant for \$5 per cord. This amounts to about \$120 to the taxpayers of this Nation instead of \$10,000 to \$20,000.

The rest of the story, as Paul Harvey likes to say, is that this past year, this timber worker had his home sold on the steps of the county courthouse for \$931.91 in back taxes. At the same time, while the Quinalt Ranger District would not sell this tree for lumber, they did not have enough money to purchase the diesel fuel to run their road grader.

Now environmentalists claim that these trees are necessary for the nutrients they provide for forest floor. Yet forestry scientists say that 90 percent of the nutrient value is found in the crown of the tree, while 80 percent of the fiber is found in the trunk. The 80 percent that we need and can be put to good use contains less than 10 percent of the nutrient value. It is possible to have the majority of the fiber we seek from these trees, and at the same time leave the majority of the nutrients behind. This is a case where you can have your cake and eat it, too.

Mr. Speaker, there are thousands of trees just like this one in the Pacific Northwest. When in full operation, Mr. Carlson could run his mill with only 150 trees like this one each year. He would employ 60 direct, full time workers, with a payroll of over \$1 million from a yearly sales total of \$7.5 to \$9 million. He would pay \$200,000 to \$400,000 per year in corporate income tax, and would pay \$1 to \$2 million to the Forest Service in stumpage fees. His employees would pay personal income tax on the over \$1 million. In addition, Mr. Carlson would employ up to 40 other people in subcontractor positions. These would be the timber cutters and haulers that would get these logs out of the forest. Sadly, if these

giants are not harvested within 2 years of being blown down, they are of no value as timber, and thus, no value to us as taxpayers. This is part of the emergency situation that we face in our forests. Unless we pass this important legislation, these giant trees will rot back into the forest floor from which they sprang. We must use common sense to make the best use of our forest resources.

#### THE IMPORTANCE OF THE SUMMER JOBS PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise this evening to help try to have a reasonable discussion to set the record straight here. Tomorrow and Thursday this House will have a major debate on actions to balance the budget of this country, starting with the goal of \$17.3 billion, trying to find money to cut across the government, and I think that the goal of trying to balance the budget is absolutely worthy, and each of us in our capacities, as chairs of committees and as Members, has to be a part of this very serious task. I think that, however, as we try to plug the dike, the holes in the dike of our increasing debt, this \$17.3 billion action is really going to be somewhat fruitless because at the same time there are billions flowing out the other side of the dike that we are not even taking a look at, and I want to talk about that tonight.

But let me say I am very proud to rise as a Democrat this evening and say that this will not be one Member who will vote to eliminate the summer jobs program, and I would love to be the opponent of any Republicans who votes to eliminate the summer jobs program—on that basis alone. In my district there are over a thousand young people; in fact there are 4,000 in line, for the summer jobs program. We want to provide the best opportunities for our young people, and yet the first place they look is the summer jobs program for our young teenagers; probably for most of them, if not all, the first opportunity they have to have any kind of gainful employment.

□ 2015

As a Democrat, on the second program, I will not vote to eliminate the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program. Twenty-five thousand senior citizens in my district benefit every year from that program. And for anybody who comes from the north and you know how cold the winters get and you know how tight those senior dollars are, I would love to be the opponent of any Republican who votes against the Low-Income Heating Assistance Program.

Let me also say as a Democrat, I will not vote to hurt seniors who are forced to buy these medigap policies when they really cannot afford supplemental insurance. And that is hidden in this rescission bill. I am proud to be a democrat and stand at the side of every poor senior citizen in our country who depends on that medigap insurance.

Now, what is interesting about this discussion is what the Republican Party will fail to go after and this is where my challenge lies with them.

Why do you not do anything about plugging the tax breaks that are there for corporate welfare? We hear a lot about welfare for ordinary citizens. What about corporate welfare? How about getting rid of the \$5 billion that is there to let these pharmaceutical companies leave the United States and manufacture offshore? There is \$5 billion of the \$17 billion right there.

How about \$30 billion worth of transfer pricing? All these foreign corporations that operate in the United States do not pay a dime of taxes. That is twice as much as you need right now to deal with the 15.3 billion.

How about all the multinational corporations that have got their hands out to the taxpayers of the United States like the market promotion program at the U.S. Department of Agriculture? We are subsidizing Pet Milk. We are subsidizing Mars Corporation. We are subsidizing Archer Daniel Midland & Company to the tune of millions of dollars a year.

But who do you go to to try to cut when you want to balance the budget? You go to the kids in my district who don't have work this summer. You go to my senior citizens who cannot pay their heating bills.

You know, I heard the Speaker say something really interesting. He is interested in privatizing NASA. Well, I do not know if I want to privatize all of NASA, but I would be happy to be a Democrat that supports privatization of the space station. That would be \$40 billion. That is three times as much as you need this first time out of the box before we start taking all of the nicks out of the weakest and most vulnerable people in this country.

And I just want to say to my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], who I know labors under great pressures of that particular committee in trying to find these spending cuts, you know, Mr. GOODLING, I do not really think—and you cannot say this and you would not say this, because you are a very loyal servant of the people—but I do not think the Speaker of this House should go to the weakest people in this society and try to balance the budget on their backs.

I would have more respect if he followed through with some of the suggestions he had, for example, with NASA, in trying to get the money we need by

cutting off some of the biggest leeches we have in this country who have their hands out and can pay for the lobbyists in this town to take out people's money and then they get kicked in the gut back in districts like mine.

I am proud to be a Democrat who is going to vote against this particular rescission bill.

#### BLOCK GRANTING CHILD NUTRI- TION PROGRAMS IS A BAD IDEA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, block granting child nutrition programs is a bad idea, but it is not a new idea. In 1982, members of this body felt it necessary to pass a bipartisan resolution opposing nutrition block grants and one of the signers of that resolution was House Speaker NEWT GINGRICH.

And in the resolution it said, "Whereas the nutrition benefits provided to our Nation's schoolchildren contribute significantly to the development of their learning potential, the Federal Government should retain primary responsibility for the child nutrition programs and such programs should not be included in any block grant." And that is a quote.

These statements, Mr. Speaker, are as true today as they were in 1982. Our Federal child nutrition programs work. They help to fight hunger. They keep our kids healthy, alert, and ready to learn every single day. Block granting child nutrition programs was a bad idea in 1982 and it is a bad idea in 1995.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said that sunshine is the best disinfectant, so I rise today to join my colleagues in shedding some light on the Republicans' plan and its devastating impact on Federal child nutrition programs and specifically the school lunch program.

The Republicans are at it again, insisting that their proposal actually preserves and strengthens the school lunch program. The very opposite is true.

As these charts behind me show, each year that the Republican block grant is in place, school meal programs will be cut. Over 5 years, funding for school meals programs will be cut resulting in a total loss of \$2.3 billion in the year 2000.

And when you combine these cuts with cuts in the funding for the child nutrition programs under the family-based block grant program, which amounts to \$4.6 billion, child nutrition programs will be cut by \$7 billion over the next 5 years.

What the American School Food Service Association—don't take my word—the American School Food Service Association says, and what our Republican colleagues do not tell us, is

that inflation with regard to this program rises 3.5 percent every year and school enrollment rises 3 percent every year. That is 6.5 percent.

My Republican colleagues tell you that they are going to increase the program 4.5 percent. And it does not take a rocket scientist to figure out that 4.5 from 6.5 is a 2-percent cut in this program. What they do not do is to include increased school enrollment, the increased cost of food prices, and a downturn in our economy.

Also, according to the American School Food Service Association, the bill cuts funding for school meal programs and places our children at risk in the following ways: First, the Republican plan means an end to free meals for the poorest children in America.

Currently children from the lowest income families receive their meals free. In my State of Connecticut, more than 13 million free meals were served last year. I went to the Simon Lake School in Milford, Connecticut, yesterday. In that very small community they served 96,000 free meals last year.

The Republican bill states that these children in the future may or may not receive free or reduced priced meals. And then it requires the States to spend only 80 percent of the money that they receive under this block grant toward providing free and reduced meals. They cut back the cost, then they say to the State: If you want you can spend only 80 percent; 20 percent of that money you can spend on anything else that you would like to.

The bill also eliminates current requirements that low-income children pay no more than 40 cents for a reduced price meal. Schools would be able to charge these kids any price they choose, 50 cents, 75 cents or even \$1 per meal. This is a hardship that many working families simply could not afford.

Second, in addition to cutting \$2.34 billion from the program, the school nutrition block grant would allow Governors to transfer up to 20 percent of the funds they receive to another block grant program. Further, Governors would no longer be required to make a State matching contribution to the program.

I will give you my own State. If the Governor of my home State of Connecticut had this kind of discretion and he chose to exercise it, the School meals program in Connecticut could lose \$2 million this year.

Let me conclude. As my colleagues have said, school lunches are an essential part of every child's day and benefit every American child in the public school. We should not be tampering with a program that works. I say, leave the school lunch program alone and protect the children of America.

#### NATIONAL SCHOOL NUTRITION PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, since the death of Chairman Carl Perkins, I have proudly accepted my role as the son of school lunch and child nutrition. He was the father.

I am really disappointed with the press accounts of the last several weeks, with the accounts of some of my colleagues, with those who are inside the Beltway as nutrition lobbyists. I do not take exception to the fact that perhaps their philosophy is different and they want to defend their philosophy against mine. But I do object to the fact that if they had read what is in H.R. 999, I do object to the fact that they are being Herman Goebbels, who was Hitler's propaganda expert. And he basically said that if you tell a lie enough times and big enough and long enough, you will get a lot of people to believe it.

And that is very discouraging to me because, as I said, if it is a philosophical difference, I do not have any problem with that. But if you will not read what is in H.R. 999, I do have a problem with that. Or if you have read it and you mischaracterize what is in it, I really have a problem with that.

Since the death of Chairman Perkins, I have shepherded, protected, and guided these programs in Congress. I heard someone say this evening that they have a vision of the future for children. I have a vision for the future of our children. And that vision is to have the healthiest children in the world.

But my vision goes beyond that. Because my vision is I want them to have a guaranteed hope that they can grab a piece of the American dream.

You cannot have it both ways. You cannot grow a debt by millions and trillions of dollars every couple years and expect that these children will ever have an opportunity to grab a piece of the American dream.

I heard someone else say, terrible, no counseling in H.R. 999. I do not know what bill he was referring to. He was not referring to H.R. 999. That I am sure of. But he said there was no counseling for WIC. The very first goal they have to meet in WIC is that of counseling.

The last speaker changed her tune a little bit later, but initially said, And then they can use the 20 percent for anything they want to use it for. Obviously, she either had not read H.R. 999 or is not interested in knowing what is said in H.R. 999.

I would like to do a couple things this evening. First of all, I would like to talk a little bit about the program that we now have. Because I have a

feeling that there are not too many people out there that really even understand the present national school lunch program and that is what we are talking about.

If you do not participate in a national school lunch program, you do not have to feed free and reduced-priced meals except in three States, and that is why I have worked so hard to protect the national school lunch program.

□ 2030

But the existing program, you get reimbursed from the Federal Government for free meals. Children of families below 130 percent of poverty, \$19,240 for a family of four, they receive \$1.76, plus 14 cents in commodities, \$1.90 subsidized by the Federal Government.

In the present program, if you receive a reduced price meal, you come from children of families between 130 and 185 percent of poverty, which is up to \$27,380 for a family of four, and you receive \$1.36 in cash and 14 cents in commodities.

If you are a full-program participant, your parents believe they are spending the full price for your meal. These are children of families over 185 percent of poverty, over \$27,380 for a family of four. The Federal Government subsidizes, the taxpayers subsidize, 18 cents cash, 14 cents commodities. You are not sending the full amount to school for your children who are participating in a paying meal program.

We did that for many reasons when we were able to afford it. We did it, as I said earlier, to try to keep the school lunch program going, the national school lunch program going, so free and reduced price meals would be available.

We do not have the luxury to say that we will continue to do everything the way we have done it in the past, because as I mentioned, if you are growing trillions of dollars of debt in a few years' time, you are denying these same children any hope for a decent future in this country.

Now, at the present time the Clinton budget called in 1995 for \$4,712,000,000. Our proposal for 1996 is \$4,712,000,000.

In the President's budget, he proposes \$656 million in commodities. We have \$638 million in commodities.

The President proposes for State administration \$92 million. We propose \$98 million. That is the school lunch program as it is today.

Now, let us take a look at what we have done in committee. The first thing I want to talk about is the difference between H.R. 4 and H.R. 999, because I am giving some people who are standing up here saying incorrect things and I am giving the press the benefit of the doubt, the fact that they did not read H.R. 999, and are only talking about H.R. 4. Let me point out the differences.

H.R. 4 is one block grant to the States and combines all the programs. H.R. 999, because we in committee did not accept what was in H.R. 4, the one block grant proposal, created in nutrition alone two separate block grants, and then we created two additional block grants for child care and other programs.

H.R. 4 distributes funds to the States based on the lower living standard, and does not take into consideration current participation rates. On the other hand, H.R. 999 provides States the first year funding based on participation this year, a hold-harmless. However, in the next several years, it is based on participation, which is exactly the way it should be based. And that is what we do in H.R. 999.

H.R. 4 eliminated the entitlement status of all programs included in the block grant. H.R. 999, the program we are talking about, makes the school nutrition block grant a cap entitlement to the States, thereby ensuring a level of funding for each fiscal year.

H.R. 4 eliminated support payments for children in the school lunch program with incomes above 185 percent of poverty. H.R. 999 does not limit a State's ability to support meals for the paying child. It provides that 80 percent, and that figure was chosen because that is the figure at the present time for those who are receiving free and reduced price meals, it provides that 80 percent must go to those who are receiving free and reduced price meals.

The other 20 percent can be used for those who are below the 185 percent level of poverty, if that is what they need it for, or it can be used for the infrastructure of the school lunch program, if that is what they need to keep the school lunch program going, or they can transfer it, not to anything they want, as some people have said; they can transfer it to one of the other block grants only, only after the person who runs the program certifies that they have met all of our goals.

This is the difference between revenue sharing and block granting. We have set the goals. We have told them what the outcome has to be, and we have a way to assess that.

H.R. 4 set aside 12 percent of available funds for the WIC program. H.R. 999 creates a family nutrition block grant and reserves 80 percent of available funds for WIC. H.R. 4 contained no guidance to the States regarding the use of funds. H.R. 999 establishes program goals, specifies the uses of funds in each block grant, and contains reporting requirements which allow us to determine whether or not States are meeting such goals.

H.R. 4 did not require States to establish nutritional standards for assistance offered under the block grant. H.R. 999 requires States to develop their own nutritional standards based

on the most recent tested nutritional research, or to adopt the nutritional standards developed for each block grant by the Food and Nutrition Board of the National Academy of Sciences.

A big difference, folks. If you have not read H.R. 999, I would suggest you do it, and perhaps you would not come and make statements on the floor that are positively incorrect in relationship to H.R. 999.

It was mentioned by my colleague who is the chairman of the subcommittee that these programs have been good programs. There is no question about it. Are there any programs that cannot be better programs? Well, I will guarantee you, every program that the Federal Government runs can be a better program if Federal Government is not running the program.

What program do you know that is totally outstanding because the Federal Government has run it? I do not know of any.

What are the concerns of the existing program? There are several. The complaint that we have heard over and over and over again by the people who are on the front line, the people who are serving these meals, the people who are preparing these meals, the people who are administering the program back on the local level, is the complaint that there is so much Federal bureaucracy, so much red tape, so much paperwork, that they spend hours and much, much money doing this paperwork, meeting the bureaucratic requirements, rather than feeding needy children.

Let me tell you what the American School Food Service Association just recently stated. This is the American School Food Service Association. Somebody in one of the previous speeches referred to them.

"School nutrition programs have become increasingly complex and more costly, due to overly prescriptive, intrusive and restrictive Federal regulations." BILL GOODLING is not saying this. I am quoting this from the lobbyists who are the most active when you talk about school lunch programs.

I quote again, and complete the quote:

School nutrition programs have become increasingly complex and more costly, due to overly prescriptive, intrusive, and restrictive Federal regulations. Although there has been extensive communication with USDA, little progress has been made in simplifying regulations and limiting regulations to those specifically required by law.

The second concern we have with the existing program is there is some abuse. Unfortunately, there is some fraud. A program that is as big as this, I suppose one can expect that to happen. But let me tell you what I heard on a talk show the other day. A gentleman called in. He said he was a superintendent of schools in Texas. He asked to remain anonymous, and he asked that his school district remain

anonymous, for good reason, because the auditors would just love to catch up with the gentleman.

What he said was that it is to our advantage, as I pointed out before, not to look too closely at who should get free or reduced price meals, because we get much more money for free and reduced price meals. You can understand why he and his district want to remain anonymous. The auditors would have a field day, and hopefully they will catch up with whomever it was that was speaking.

The third concern we have and why we think there needs to be change, only 46 percent of those students who would be paying customers participate in the program. Only 46 percent of those eligible to be paying customers participate in the program. Part of the problem is that one size does not fit all. You do not feed Pennsylvania Dutch what you may feed an Italian community or an Irish community. They determine, going by nutritious guidelines, what it is that these young people will eat, what will cause them to participate. But only 46 percent at the present time do.

We have to do better. You cannot support the program if you have a district that has 65, 75 percent free and reduced price. You have to get the paying customers participating. And we believe by giving the kind of flexibility that we do in this legislation, that that local district will have an opportunity to meet the nutrition standards, and, at the same time, cause an influx of the paying customer coming through that line because she will eat the meal that will be served.

Let me talk a little bit more about H.R. 999. Often times you get people who have not read it who are telling us, this is what is wrong with your program.

First of all, they say it is less money. Now, you know, I wish that chart were still there, because I would like them on that chart to put the 3.1 percent that the President recommended for 1995's budget, and then see how it comes out. I would like them to put the 3.6 percent that the President suggested for an increase for next year on that chart, and then show me a little bit about who is saving and who is paying and who is cutting and who is giving more. I think they would have to turn to this side to look at the charts on this side.

Do not talk about what your dreams may be or what you think should be. That is not what your Commander in Chief, that is not what the leader of your party has recommended 1995 budget, or the 1996 budget.

We grow children, and I think it is important that we understand that. We are growing children at a greater rate than the President does in his 1995 budget, than the President does in his 1996 budget.

Let me talk about a couple other most frequently mentioned untruths. They say how about an economic downturn? Well, do you know any time this Congress has walked away from those in need? What do we do when there is a flood that we have not budgeted for? What do we do when there is an earthquake that we did not budget for? We come back for supplementals.

But we built into H.R. 999 help for this same situation, because we say you do not have to return your money at the end of the year if you have a surplus, because you had a good year. You have a 2-year carryover. You had a good year in 1996, you saved money; you have a downturn in 1995, you have that extra money.

Now, let me tell you what we do beyond 4.5 percent. We probably get to the 5.2 CBO that they like to put over there. We may even go above it, I am not sure. Because when you think of the cost of the bureaucracy, when you think of the cost of the redtape, when you think of the cost to the local school district to meet all of these nutrition paperwork programs coming from the Federal level, there is a great deal of money to be saved, to be used not to feed bureaucrats, but to be used to feed children.

□ 2045

That is what we are in the business to do.

We heard a couple of people be awfully cute. I mean, they wanted to be cute. Unfortunately, they were not too cute, because they did not read what this administration is doing.

You had the President of the United States hold up a bottle of ketchup. You had the minority leader hold up a bottle of ketchup. And they were trying to bring up this old game they played back in 1982 or 1983, which was overplayed, which had nothing to do with reality, saying that somehow or other if you had those nutritious standards, the people back there who run these programs would feed a child a half cup of ketchup.

First of all, let me say, they could not afford to feed every child a half cup of ketchup. It is much easier and cheaper to feed the child a half cup of vegetables than it is to feed them a half cup of ketchup. So it had nothing to do with reality.

But how did they get ketchup on their face? They did not check what the nutrition standards are now in their own administration, because would you believe it, they can count ketchup in their calorie count?

This administration, who was second-guessing the people back home saying that you are feeding too much fat, what the people back home were doing was following their rules and regulations, their nutrition standards.

Now, why should we trust them to continue to tell the people back home

what is the best nutrition that children should have when the very standards that they set out, then criticized the people who met their standards and said too much fat.

Again, I am afraid the two got ketchup on their face.

Let me just move on to one or two other areas. We build into our program a reward for participation. That is the way it should be. As I indicated, you have to attract the paying customer in there. You have to attract them to keep the program going.

What we say is the first year, you are held harmless and you will get, your State, the same amount of money. After that, however, it is all on participation. It goes down slightly each year, where you will get 95 percent based on your previous year, but you get 5 percent if you have an increased participation. The next year it is 10 percent. That is an encouragement to get them to do a better job. That is an encouragement to get more children participating in the program.

I have spent too much time, and I always have to laugh when people say, people who wrote this ought to get into the schools and see what is going on in the schools. For 22 years, I participated in school lunch every day, every day, sitting with the students, eating a school lunch, and for the 20 years here, I have tried to improve on that program year after year. Then I become most upset. Even a good friend sends out a "Dear Colleague" totally distorting what happened in 1982-83.

In 1982 and 1983, it was not that side of the aisle that stopped some of those revenue-sharing block grants. It was this side of the aisle, those of us who were on this committee, because they were revenue-sharing. They were not block grants. It was revenue-sharing.

I have always said if you are trillions of dollars in debt, it is pretty tough to go back home and say, "We're revenue sharing." The only thing we had to share is debt.

These block grants set the goals, say specifically what has to happen, and then give enough flexibility so the local district can make them work even better than they presently do.

Let's not mix apples and oranges. There is no comparison to what is in H.R. 999 and a revenue-sharing, massive block grant. That is why we designed H.R. 999, rather than go on with H.R. 4.

I would hope that those of you who were listening this evening are beginning to understand exactly what we have done, and what we have done is given an opportunity to grow more children than the President has requested, more children than would have been appropriated, and make sure that that increase is there year after year.

I am proud of our end product, very proud of that product. I know that peo-

ple are fearful of change. Nobody likes change. You fear change. Folks, change is inevitable. Not only is it inevitable, it is positively necessary if we are going to give these children, as I have said several times, an opportunity as adults to grab a part of that American dream.

Is there anyone out there who really believes that in the last 35 or 40 years we have helped these people grab a part of that American dream? We have done just the opposite. What we have done is enslave them. We have put them in shackles, Federal shackles, to make sure that they never have an opportunity to get a piece of that American dream.

We are going to change things so they do have that opportunity, so that they too can be participants giving to this Nation, participants who can grow independently and not depend on the Federal Government.

I yield to my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, you will not hear of a Republican or at least even very many Democrats that will say that the chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], has ever attempted to hurt kids. He has spent his life protecting them, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the honorable chairman, how many children can we feed on a bankrupt country? And today we are looking, where every child over their life, lifelong interest and account on the national debt, will be saddled with a \$180,000 debt. Yes, it will be indexed. You will have to pay the increases with inflation. That is before you buy a car or a home or everything else.

We are also looking at a Medicare system that is going bankrupt and will be in the near future. If we do not attack waste in government by bigger bureaucracies, then it is going to affect that.

I would just like to make two quick statements and I have a lot of my colleagues that want to speak, and I would yield back to the gentleman.

One, when the other side of the aisle talks about cuts, I have been here for 4 years. The rhetoric was confusing to the American people, where Democrats were saying, Well, look what we have done, we have cut this budget, but yet the American people could not figure out how we keep spending more.

I have an example, Mr. Speaker, that if my mom in San Diego, CA, Escondido, said, "Son, we have a turkey this Thanksgiving and next Thanksgiving, your brother and family is coming over. I am going to project that I need 10 turkeys for next year."

Well, a few months before Thanksgiving, Mom calls up and says, "Son, your brother can't come, he's got to

work, but the family's coming. I'm only going to need seven turkeys instead of 10 turkeys."

Under the Democratic accounting principles, I have just cut 30 percent of the turkeys, when in essence I have increased it by 60 percent. I have gone from 1 to 7. I have not cut 30 percent. That is what they are trying to confuse the issue with, with the other chart.

The second point is that I would like to finish a statement on what the committee did on illegal immigration. Would American citizens like to feed the world? Probably the answer is yes. If you asked them the question, Would they like to do it on the backs of our children, the answer would be most definitely no.

We have eliminated illegal immigrants from all 23 programs that they previously held. We have 400,000 illegal children in California, just in California schools, K through 12, at over \$1.33 a meal. That is over \$1 million a day, 800,000 meals a day, just for illegals.

Mr. GOODLING. I would imagine they are receiving \$1.90 a day.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. No, I am trying to do it on a conservative basis. Then if you look at an average in California, it takes a kindergartner through high school, 12th grade, \$5,000 a year to educate that child. That is \$2 billion a year. Yet we are decrying that we do not have enough money for nutrition.

We have added money for nutrition. We have cut the bureaucracies. But what we also did is said, our priority in this country with limited resources, with the national debt getting out of shape, with the national deficit, and the President's budget increasing the national deficit by \$300 billion, our priorities are American children, and we want to feed those children. We want to make sure that no child under any circumstances goes hungry.

Should a high-income parent be subsidized by the Federal Government? Absolutely not. But the chairman has provided for those children 185 percent below the poverty level that we are going to make sure that they are fed. Again, the priority of disestablishing big government and who should receive the support are the kids that most need it.

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KNOLLENBERG].

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities for yielding. I especially want to thank him not just for his leadership this year but for a countless number of years.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has lived the life that many of us do not have or did not have the opportunity to do in terms of looking over the lunch programs from a perspective of a couple of feet. Most of us get most of our information from a book, a

newspaper, from a pamphlet, from charts, information such as this.

I want to talk with my colleagues for a moment about the school-based child care block grant contained in the House Republican welfare bill. It has been subjected to vicious attacks by the White House and other defenders of the status quo, and I say defenders of government bureaucracy, of Federal bureaucracy.

I appreciate this opportunity to take just a moment and, with my colleagues, tell the truth about the House Republican welfare bill. I believe for the last few weeks, the American people have been deceived. Some would say maybe more strongly they have been lied to. But the Democratic Party, some of those who preceded us here this evening, have distorted the facts and attempted to use children to promote the political agenda, and one by one they have paraded out on the House floor to tell the story, make the claims that House Republicans are taking food out of the mouths of children. I have to say that nothing could be further from the truth.

The House Republican welfare bill actually expands the Federal commitment to child nutrition.

I will admit, maybe our block grants are a bad deal for Washington bureaucrats.

□ 2100

But they are a great deal for the local administrators of school lunches who no longer will have to wade through tons of redtape to provide nutritious meals to schoolchildren.

I would like to reaffirm what has already been brought out this evening that I would like to inform the American people and reaffirm that our proposal, the Republican proposal, increases funding for school lunches, as has been said, by 4.5 percent each year.

The other thing that is important, I think, to remember is that the total Federal funding for the school-based nutrition block grant over 5 years is real money. It is \$36 billion, and despite this strong commitment to school-based food programs, Democrats are trying to convince the American people that the Republican Party has turned its back on the poor, and I think it is time the American people know the truth.

The school-based nutrition block grant proposed by the party, by the Republican Party, will greatly improve the way we provide school meals to needy children. It returns decisionmaking back home and removes the one-size-fits-all mandates that will allow States to provide nutritious meals to kids.

Now, one of the things that I really do not understand is why the Democratic Party, certain members, are so distrustful of the States. The Federal Government does not have a monopoly

on compassion and, contrary to popular belief in this body by some, Congress does not have all the answers, not all of the answers to our Nation's problems. Governors and State lawmakers also have concerns about the well-being of children, and they live closer to the fact, to those children. They have a direct interest in promoting the health and development of the children in their States. They are not going to walk away from those responsibilities.

Just yesterday I had a chance to talk to the Governor of my State, Governor Engler, from Michigan. He is excited about this new majority in the House of Representatives. He is excited because they are willing to give him the flexibility that he wants and needs to design and craft some of the innovative solutions that will make a big difference, a positive difference, in the lives of those persons that are trapped in the current welfare system. He understands, and he assured me that he and the other Governors understand, that there is importance in providing nutritious school meals, and they do not want to shortchange the kids.

I truly believe that the States can do a better job with welfare reform, that welfare reform over and above what the Federal Government has done, and the House Republican welfare bill will encourage creativity at the State level instead of stifling it, and as a result, I am confident that we have offered a positive alternative to the current wasteful welfare system.

I urge the American people to search out the truth, listen to both sides. I believe that you will find there is no reason that you have to be lied to, to be deceived.

In closing, I just would like to reaffirm, restate, and it has been stated several times, but I do not think it hurts to drum it a few more times, the Republican bill increases funding for school lunches by 4.5 percent per year. By the year 2000, we will be spending \$1 billion more on school lunches than we spend today.

We are not taking the food from the mouths of hungry children. We are streamlining the administrative costs and allowing more money to be spent on lunches instead of paper, paper-shuffling.

So I think it is time, and I am delighted, Mr. Chairman, that you have taken the leadership again to promote the facts that should be aired so that the American people can sort through the rhetoric and look at truly what is in this welfare bill, this child block grant bill and, frankly, I say again it is shameful that individuals would use children as political props.

I thank you for yielding, I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for participating, a member of our committee, and I yield to another

gentleman from our committee, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the gentleman.

Before I get into my remarks, I want to congratulate you on an excellent presentation of the true facts about the Republican proposal to reform our school lunch program, our child nutrition programs, in ways that put more food in the mouths of kids and helps more people in this country, and you clearly, in your presentation, dispelled the falsehoods and the untruths that are being stated not only by people in the opposition but as well by people in the media who do not understand what we are trying to do here.

When I won my election, and this is my first time in Congress, I am one of the new freshman Congressmen, I had a lot of people tell me, "DAVE, you have got a tough job ahead of you. You face some real serious challenges up there in Washington, and the biggest one of them all, the budget deficit."

How do we rein in this budget monster? Clearly there was no other issue that Republicans and Democrats came together on more clearly than that issue. They all recognized it as being a serious problem, and how do we deal with it, particularly when we look at so much of the money that is spent up here in Washington is going to so many very, very good causes.

When I first was delighted to find that I was going to be on the Education and Economic Opportunities Committee with Chairman GOODLING, I was very challenged to see what we could do to make the system better and help us move our Nation towards a balanced budget so that we could have our children, instead of inheriting bankruptcy and debt, inheriting prosperity, so that our children would be able to have the opportunities that I had as a young man growing up in our Nation.

And there was probably no program that I saw a bigger challenge than our school nutrition and our childhood nutrition programs, because I have been able to see firsthand the benefits of so many of these programs. And I was very, very intrigued to see in the hearings that we held in our committee that many of the people directly involved in these programs were able to recognize that there were some very, very clear inefficiencies. We had witnesses come before us telling us how they were just burdened with too much bureaucracy and too much redtape and how there is a separate application program for the breakfast program, and a separate application for the lunch program, and a separate accounting process for the summer nutrition program, and how much better it would be if we would block grant these programs and eliminate bureaucracy.

After we held those hearings, I was so delighted to see you, Chairman GOODLING, come forward with a program, a

solution to this problem, that would allow us to eliminate bureaucracy, eliminate redtape, and put more resources in the hands of State officials that would allow them to feed more kids, feed more of the hungry, and at the same time help us move towards that desired goal of reining in this deficit monster and moving towards a balanced budget. And we were able to do all of this in the framework of actually modestly increasing the funding for these programs at 4.5 percent per year.

We had Governors come before us and tell us that in that type of an environment they could feed many more children than what we were able to do with the current system.

I think what we have seen coming from the opposition for the past 2 weeks, the past 3 weeks, as well as liberal members of the media, in my opinion, is just fear of change. The American people are the people who are asking for change. They voted in change on November 8, and we are coming up with innovative ways to change the system for the better and, yes, there are people who are stuck in the past, stuck in the old ways of doing business who are making claims that are not true.

But I am very proud to be on the committee with you, Mr. Chairman, and to be able to support you in this effort, and I can say that the other freshman members of the committee, the Republican members of the committee, stand with you and are ready to help you get this program through and make sure it does what we desire it to do.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the gentleman for participating.

I now yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. GRAHAM], who is also a member of the committee.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I, too, have enjoyed the committee. We are dealing with tough issues, but I think in a responsible fashion.

The frustrating thing is to be on that committee at 2 o'clock in the morning sometimes to deal with this legislation and get up and read the paper the next day and wonder, "Is that the committee that I was on?" It has been very difficult back home to get the truth out. So I had a news conference at the statehouse with my Governor and superintendent of education where we got together and kind of held hands and said we can handle this at the local level if you give us a chance, and I think our new Governor, Governor Beasley, and the superintendent of education, Mrs. Nelson, we can handle it if we give them a chance.

The thing that struck me the most about this debate, there have been a lot of charts put up. There are, I guess, two or three sides to every story. I am willing to concede something. I am willing to concede the people on the

other side of the aisle care about children. I think people on our committee care about children. I think people on our committee care about children, the Democrats. They just have a different view of how government should interact in taking care of real problems. It is OK to differ. That is what makes this country great.

I just wish certain people on the other side of the aisle would admit that LINDSEY GRAHAM cares about children, because I do, and that David Beasley, my Governor, cares about children.

When it comes time to figure out how to change things, I would like people to think of concepts. Block-granting is a concept that is not that hard to understand. If you believe in a basic principle that everybody cares about children, that the people in South Carolina maybe care more about the children in South Carolina than the people in the Department of Agriculture, and I am willing to concede the bureaucrats in the Department of Agriculture care about people in South Carolina, but when you come up to Washington, drive by the Department of Agriculture building and ask yourself this, do the people in that building know more about the children in my district than I do? Do they care more about the children in my district than I do? Do they care more about the children in my State than my Governor? I think if you are honest with yourself that the answer would be no.

I live in an area that in the recent past in my lifetime, we have had abusive policies toward our fellow citizens. There has been discrimination in my State and other States in the South and throughout this country just not based on region where people did not get a fair break because of the color of their skin. That was wrong.

I have experienced change, and change is good. States' rights is something we talk about a lot. We have got to remember in the past the States have been irresponsible at times in treating their citizens fairly.

I can tell you this, that LINDSEY GRAHAM is not one of those politicians. My Governor is not one of those politicians. We have matured as a society.

The biggest fear and threat I think minority citizens have today is a Federal Government that does not allow them to get off welfare and get a job. The whole idea about caring has been talked about a lot tonight. I just wish people would admit that I care about the people in my district as much as anybody in Washington, DC, that my Governor cares about the children more than anybody in Washington, DC, in South Carolina, and block granting has a basic premise that that is the truth. If you believe that, you support block granting.

Cost, we talked a lot about cost. Right now, 25 percent of the money in the WIC Program goes to administer

the program. We are trying to reduce the administration of these programs to get more money into the hands of the State people with less cost to feed and take care of more children and more new mothers, and one way you can do that is cut out the Federal middleman. Every business in America works on that concept of trying to reduce costs by streamlining the efficiency of delivery. That is all we are doing here.

And one thing I would like people at home to realize, why would Bill Clinton propose a 3.1 percent growth in this program, get on television, have his picture made in a school lunch setting, and accuse the Republicans of cutting the program when we have added more to the program than he has? I think the answer is pretty obvious. He has no agenda. He has abandoned welfare. The Clinton welfare reform proposal is nothing.

We are doing something, and the only way he can get out of this box is to criticize others who are taking an active role.

AL GORE's Reinventing Government, in my opinion, is a joke. Nobody has come to my office and said, "Congressman GRAHAM, AL GORE is going too far." I have not had one bureaucrat complain about AL GORE's Reinventing Government.

□ 2115

I have had everybody and their brother in Washington complain about what we are trying to do to reform welfare, and to me it is working because the right people are complaining. If you want to change something, somebody is going to complain and the people that are complaining are the right people. That is the bureaucrats in this town.

The people in my district, when they are told the truth, are not complaining. They do not want somebody making \$100,000 a year to get a subsidized school lunch program. They do not want someone going to day care getting a subsidized school lunch program if they can afford to pay for it because we are broke up here.

The reason I am optimistic, Mr. Chairman, that we are on the right track is because the right people are complaining, those people that believe in big government, those people that care about children, but believe the only way you can care is spend from Washington, DC. I believe you can care and allow people to take care of their own at home and save money at the same time. I believe that very deeply and that is why I am supporting what you are doing and I will compliment you on that very reasonable approach to a real serious problem.

Mr. GOODLING. I would yield again to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I thank the chairman and I would like the chair-

man, if he would, from his years of experience here, perhaps he could comment on why the President would do such a thing as accuse us of cutting these programs excessively when we, in reality, increased the funding for these programs over and above what the President had requested?

He requested, as my colleague from South Carolina very, very eloquently and appropriately pointed out, he requested a 3.1 percent increase and we on our committee, under your leadership, came in with a 4.5-percent increase, which is a 1.4-percent increase over and above what he himself had requested, and then he engages in the shameful act of appearing in school lunch lines claiming that we are cutting these programs too much.

I do not understand that, Mr. Chairman, and maybe you can explain that to me, and I took the liberty of putting up that chart there that I think shows our growth, and maybe you could explain that to us here and let us know what those numbers mean. That is a little complicated, but perhaps you could.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman will yield, I say to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. WELDON], I am not a member of the committee and I want to make—I am really glad that I came down here tonight because this is the most honest and healthy debate I have heard so far about this bill, because what I read in the newspaper and what I have heard on the news and what I have heard from some of the special interest groups does not match what we are seeing on these charts and what I have heard tonight.

Let me ask anybody here, and Mr. Chairman or Mr. WELDON or Mr. GRAHAM, if you want to respond to this, we are actually going to be spending 4.5 percent more in each of the years and the President only recommended what percentage increase?

Mr. GOODLING. He recommended 3.1 this year and 3.6 next year.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Three point one, 4.5. In other words, we are going to be spending about 30 percent more than the President recommended?

Mr. GOODLING. That is why I said I would like to see them put their chart up there and put his 3.1 and 3.6 over there rather than talk about what a CBO baseline is.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. It is interesting, because when we first came here, we are all freshmen, we were not part of accumulating this huge national debt, and I think we all made the pledge to our voters last year that we want to do something about that, and we need some change around Washington.

We came here to change the way Washington does business and yet what we have heard from many leaders on the other side, including the person down at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, is that they want to fiercely defend the

status quo, and I think the American people do want change.

In fact, it was less than a month ago that the President stood right up there and he said in his speech that we were not giving the American people enough change and now he had heard the message from the November elections.

I did not know until tonight though that we are actually going to be spending 30 percent more than the President requested. As somebody said when we first got here, people around here sometimes give the word "hypocrisy" a bad name.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  
Mr. GOODLING. And I yield back to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I just want to thank the gentleman from Minnesota, and I just also would like to share with the chairman that as a physician who practiced medicine up until I came here, that I had the opportunity firsthand to see the effects of malnutrition and the medical consequences of that and how it really is in our Nation's best interest to make sure our children are properly fed.

However, I do feel that it is the primary responsibility of parents to make sure that their children are properly fed and that we have had an erosion of responsibility in our Nation over the many years that the minority was in control because of an excessive tendency of the Government to take responsibility where parents should have been having responsibility.

And if I may go on a little further, Mr. Chairman, into this, I have seen the consequences of malnutrition and I expressed some of those concerns to you and to other members of the committee and I was very alarmed and shocked to learn that a substantial percentage of the program as it was devised up here actually was going to feed the children of people who really did not need this kind of financial support, that there were lots of middle class and actually children from affluent families who were getting subsidized meals in schools, and this is one of the very reasons why the Governors came to us and said that they wanted to take over managing these programs, because they, in their States at the local level, like the gentleman from South Carolina was describing, can better determine where the areas of poverty are, who would benefit the most from these programs, and I thought that was wonderful that you could design this program through this block grant to go make sure that the people who really needed it were getting it and the people who did not need it were no longer getting it.

I commend you and I commend the other members of the committee and the staff who were able to come up with this Child Nutrition Block Grant Program, and I think it is going to be a tremendous success.

Mr. GOODLING. One of the other tragedies, as I mentioned, that we had poor participation as far as paying customers are concerned in the School Lunch Program, but there is an even greater tragedy. We have about 46 percent of free and reduced priced people who do not participate in the program. So I am saying, just because someone says it is a good program, it has to be a better program because that 46 percent are in need of the program and are not participating.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. If I may interrupt the chairman, could you explain why so many of those people who need it are not participating in the program?

Mr. GOODLING. I think I said part of that in my opening statement in that the one size fits all from Washington, DC, we know best what is best for this town or this city or this State, does not sell back home, and those people back home know what nutritious food they can serve the children will eat and then you get the participation.

Did the gentleman from Minnesota have any—I wanted to summarize.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. On that point, I want to say and it has been said tonight, it is very important. People do resist change and there is no institution that resists change more than a monopolistic bureaucracy, and what you are really trying to do is decentralize this program and that is what we have to do. It has to be consumer driven.

The people out in the districts and the Governors are not heartless people. They want their kids to get nutritious meals as well. I think this is a good plan. I think it is a first step. I think once we get more of these facts out here—as I say, if I did not know that we were spending 30 percent more than the President requested, if I did not know that as a Member of Congress until tonight, I will guarantee you that an awful lot of American people did not know that but they are going to know it sooner or later.

Thomas Jefferson perhaps said it best. "Give the American people the truth and the Republic will be saved." All we really have to do is get the facts out about this program. I think the American people will see the wisdom of it. I think it is a good plan. We ought to pass it.

I hope colleagues will join us in this because if the American people get the facts about this, they will buy into this idea.

Mr. GOODLING. Let me quickly say that I again do not argue with somebody's philosophy. If they have a philosophical difference, that is fine. If they believe one size fits all, that is fine. I do not happen to have that philosophy. If they believe that the Federal Government has all the answers to all the problems, I do not have any problem with their philosophy. I do not agree

with it, but I do not have any problem with it. That is their philosophy.

If they believe that we have helped those on welfare in the last 35 years, go on dreaming. I do not happen to believe that. The only thing I request is, please read the legislation and then discuss the legislation.

Mr. President, we are not cutting and gutting school lunch and child nutrition programs. We are cutting bureaucracy. We want to grow healthy children. We are not trying to grow healthy or unhealthy bureaucracies. And so I hope that everyone from the Commander in Chief on down will read what is in H.R. 999 so that they actually can participate in a debate intelligently and talk about the facts. And again, as you pointed out over and over again, we are doing better to grow healthy children than the President has recommended.

I appreciate all of your participation this evening and I hope that the public has been listening and I hope that they will now better understand what the existing program is and what we are doing in the future to try to change to make sure that more children have an opportunity and more pregnant women have an opportunity to participate in nutritious meals programs.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1158, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE AND RESCISSIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1995

Mr. DREIER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-78) on the resolution (H. Res. 115) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PEACE, JUSTICE, AND OPPORTUNITY FOR ALL

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

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, no discussion is more important than the one that is now under way here in Washington concerning the budget and all matters related to fiscal appropriations policies. The discussion that we have just heard is a very vital one. It relates to one small facet of the total budget and one small portion of the Contract With America.

The question of school lunches and whether they have been cut or not has been thoroughly discussed and we will have some more discussion on it. It is

very important because in the process of trying to save money on school lunches, there has been some trickery. We are moving under the cover of a block grant and we are talking about giving additional money to take care of inflation. We are not discussing the fact that an entitlement is being taken away, an entitlement.

Every hungry child who has a certain income level is entitled now to a free lunch, which means that no matter how large that number increases and how great it becomes, the free lunch will always be there for the hungry child. In the block grant process, there is a finite number of children who can be fed. The Federal Government has only provided a finite amount of money. There is no supplementary budget at the Federal level that you can fall back on. You cannot go to the treasury of the Federal Government. They have washed their hands of the process once they give the block grant. So it is up to the States. It is up to the local government to pick up at that point and that is a part of the discussion. We can talk more and more about that but it is only a small part of the total picture.

Let us not talk so much about what has been cut so far, although that is important, the fact that school lunches are on the block and they are being squeezed in devious ways to save money. The fact that the summer youth employment programs, one of the most basic, practical, and concrete programs ever devised by the Federal Government where teenagers are employed during the summer, that also is on the chopping block.

In the rescission process, they have put zero in the budget for the remainder of this year, reached into the current budget, money that has already been authorized, programs that have already been authorized, money that has already been appropriated is now being taken out of the current budget for the year which ends on September 30, 1995. That is called a rescission process. It is a cruel process of having people who anticipate that they are going to get certain kinds of programs and funding suddenly wake up and discover that it has been snatched away in this budget year, before we get to the process of the next budget year, 1996 budget year, which begins October 1, 1995.

So we are cutting programs which have relatively small amounts of money attached to them when you look at the total budget and benefit large numbers of people, programs that have been demonstrated to be workable, programs which go straight to the heart of the matter and serve the poorest people in the country. We are cutting them, and one of the questions is, why are we cutting these programs and not cutting other programs? And I will get to that later.

I think it is important to understand that the budget-making process is a vital part of a bigger process whereby we are defining our vision for America as we see it, as we go forward the year 2000 and beyond.

□ 2130

What happens this year will determine what is going to be happening in the next 10 to 20 years. This is a pivotal year. It is a pivotal year because the majority in the Congress that has just taken over has made it a pivotal year, and we should not back away from the challenge of making a lot of very basic decisions which will set the course of America for the next 10 to 20 years. We will not back away from it. Let us just understand that everything that is being done; those things that have dollars attached to them, and many of them that do not have dollars attached to them, are a part of a process to prepare America for a future that is going to be a future basically to serve a small elite group of people or a future America that belongs to everybody. I say it is a conflict, a battle, between the oppressive elite minority and the caring majority. I think there is definitely a cleavage here, unlike any we have seen before.

There is a group, which I call the oppressive elite minority, who have a great deal of education, a great deal of understanding about how to use power. They have a great knowledge of how to use information. They know how to control and make very good use of media. But the oppressive elite minority is lacking in compassion. The oppressive elite minority has a distorted vision of what America should be all about. This oppressive elite minority, in charge of Congress now, has a vision which seeks to throw certain groups of people overboard. It has a mentality of triage. It is basically saying that there are some things that are not in the American dream for all people. In fact only a small group should benefit.

This kind of philosophy is a distortion, in my opinion, of where we ought to go. It is the wrong vision. They are clear on where they want to go. They are forceful about where they want to go. But I say that they are very wrong. It is a mean-spirited approach.

In fact, you can go further and say it is a dangerous and deadly approach because of its basic assumption that we cannot build an America that serves all people, we cannot have an America which provides freedom, peace, justice, and opportunity for everybody. The patterns that they are laying out is a pattern which says we can only do it for an elite oppressive minority.

The budget cuts are the center of this whole process of redefining what America is all about. The budget cuts are at the center of the vision that is being laid out by both groups. I think we should accept the challenge that is

being laid down by the majority party in the House of Representatives.

A challenge that they are laying down is that they have a vision for the new world order, they have a vision as to where America should be going, and we would like to offer an alternative vision. I am the chairman of a Congressional Black Caucus alternative budget committee, and we are going to accept the challenge of offering an alternative budget, and that budget will be very much a vision of where we think America should be going between now and the year 2000 or 2002.

Certain rules are being made about how this budget is going to be handled. The rumor is that we cannot bring any alternative or substitute budget to the floor of the House unless that budget shows where we are going to balance the budget by the year 2002. If we cannot balance the budget by the year 2002, we will not be allowed to put it on the floor is the rumor. It has not been finalized yet.

Well, we accept that challenge. If we have to prepare a balanced budget by the year 2002, that is the only way we can present the Congressional Black Caucus budget alternative, then we will bring to the floor a budget which will be balanced by the year 2002, but in the process of balancing the budget we are going to demonstrate what the vision of a caring majority is. We are going to show how a budget can be balanced by making cuts of programs that are really not in the best interests of the great majority of Americans. The budget that we will bring forward will have the support of the great majority of the American people because there is a caring majority.

The people who came out to vote on November 8 do not represent a mandate, did not offer a mandate, they do not represent a body on which a revolution can be based. We had about 38 to 39 percent of the people who were eligible to vote in America who came out, and half of those people voted for the party that won the majority. The half of 39 percent, 38 percent, is certainly not a majority of Americans. The Americans who did not come out to vote, in a large number who came out to vote and did not vote for the winners, they constitute the caring majority.

The caring majority is made up of people who are not wise enough to come out to vote and who did not protect their own interests in the proper way, but the caring majority also includes a lot of enlightened people who do vote and who do not identify with the policies of the elite oppressive minority who won the majority of the seats in the House. The caring majority is made up with people who are not necessarily homeless or do not even have the problem in getting shelter or buying homes, but they recognize that there are homeless people in America,

and they want to see the America which provides the opportunity for everybody to have a decent home. They may not want to live next to homeless people, and that should not be the test of their compassion. The test of their compassion and their membership in the caring majority is do they believe that every American ought to have a decent home, an opportunity to have a decent home? A caring majority is made up of people who are not hungry, people who have plenty to eat and have good jobs, but the caring majority includes people who have good jobs, plenty to eat, who are willing to look at people who do not have jobs and do not have enough to eat, and they are willing to support public policies which are going to provide employment for all people. They are willing to support public policies which will allow everybody to earn an income and be able to provide the basic necessities of food, clothing, and shelter. The caring majority is made up of people like that who are voting and who will be on the side of those who are in need and who are being affected by the safety nets which are being removed by this oppressive elite minority.

We have a vision of America that is very different from the vision of the oppressive elite minority. We are not afraid to offer that vision.

On the other hand, we recognize that shortcomings of a vision of the elite minority, it is a vision of America for the few. It is a vision of America for the privileged. It is a vision of America for a new computer class. The cutoff is whether you can own a computer or not, I suppose from the kinds of language used by this oppressive elite minority. Traditional working class people are not included in the vision of this elite minority as to who America should exist for.

They do not include construction workers, for example, who always are a part of the middle class. They made good salaries in the past, and they have been supported in the past by both parties. In fact, most construction workers a few years ago we would say would definitely fall in the Republican Party. They had that kind of outlook on life. They were part of the establishment, making very good salaries, and we are surprised and shocked that the new oppressive elite minority in control of this Congress is moving rapidly to take away basic benefits from construction workers. The repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act is high on the list, high on the agenda, of the oppressive elite minority/majority now in control of Congress. They do not want to see construction workers paid decent wages. They want to take out the Davis-Bacon Act which controls the situation which can easily be exploited if it is not there. They do not want to have much to do with organized labor in general.

Our great middle class, the greatest portion of the American middle class,

have been working people traditionally. We created a phenomenon that never existed in the history of the world when we began to pay millions of workers decent wages. We created the great American market, the great American consumer market, which sustained this country and built our capitalism into the strongest system of democratic capitalism in the world. Everybody wanted to get into the American consumer market, and we have allowed in many cases too generously—we have been too generous in allowing the Japanese to get into the American consumer market, the Germans to get into the American consumer market, everybody comes along with products, rushers to the great American consumer market to sell products and to benefit greatly. Japanese riches have been built on that openness of our consumer market.

That consumer market would not exist if we had not had the American labor movement, if we had not had a situation where the forces combine, the workers themselves, and enlightened Government starting with FDR, and an acceptance by the Republican Party, acceptance by the corporations, that it was good to have labor peace, it was good to pay decent wages, and we went forward all together under that system.

But, no, we want to turn the clock back and stop that in this present Congress controlled by the oppressive elite minority. The oppressive elite minority's leadership right away took the Education and Labor Committee and changed the name. They wanted to immediately insult labor by taking labor out of the name of a major committee on Congress so we no longer have any committee of Congress that has the word "labor" in it. They proceeded to move to repeal certain portions of the National Labor Relations Act. All kinds of things are moving forward to oppress and to squeeze the traditional middle class of working Americans, working Americans who do belong to the middle class. They want to redefine the middle class and push down those who before, who heretofore, have belonged to the great middle class.

Public education is now under attack by this oppressive elite minority. The leadership of this Congress, majority of this Congress, the leadership now wants to eliminate the Department of Education. They have gone after education programs with a large number of rescissions already before we get into the process of making the budget for next year. They want to pull back funds for large numbers of programs in this year. They propose first to cut Head Start, and then when they were forced to back away from that, they have cut title I programs. The most basic Federal aid to education is funneled through title I, formerly called chapter 1 programs. Public education is

under attack, and after many years under Ronald Reagan and under President Bush, after years of recognizing that America had a problem with education, and after every President starting with President Reagan, attempted to move forward in some way to establish a Federal presence in education. We are now ready to recklessly retreat, recklessly eradicate all the work that has been done by Reagan, Bush, and Clinton and tear down the Federal involvement in education, just wipe out the Department of Education. We will be the only industrialized nation which does not have a centralized Department of Education to provide some guidance and some direction for the education function. We will rapidly begin to decline in our ability to compete once the Department of Education is gone.

But the oppressive elite minority is blinded by their own ideological biases, and they want to wipe out the effectiveness of public education. They are going to look to other ways to provide education, those that they think should be educated. The rest they will throw overboard, the billions of dollars. The riches of America will not be used for one of the most fundamental functions of society, the education of the populace. Nothing is more important to our national security than the education of the populace. The education of the American people will keep them competitive. The education of the American people will maintain civility and lessen friction, lessen crime, lessen disorder. The education of the American people is the most important function of Government as we go toward the new world order. Far more important in our national defense and our national security is education than new weapon systems.

But we define what we are all about, as I said before, by the steps we take in our policies and especially in our fiscal policies, budget policies, and other monetary policies. The steps that are being taken now are clearly defining what I call a high tech, a group of high technology barbarians, well educated people who understand how to use information, but who lack compassion, and in the final analysis, because they lack compassion, they lack the vision necessary to carry us forward and build on the greatness that already exists in America. The vision of a caring majority is very different from the vision of the oppressive elite minority.

□ 2145

The vision of the caring majority sees the possibility of peace, justice and opportunity for all of the people. We do not see America going bankrupt. We do not want to preach scarcity. We are not Bangladesh. We have the resources necessary to provide for a society and an economy that can support peace, justice and opportunity for all of the people.

We can provide health care for all of the people. We can provide housing for all of the people. We can provide employment for all of the people. The resources are there.

The caring majority is there. And given the opportunity, we are going to find a rejection of the kind of policies and programs being put forward by this elite, oppressive elite minority.

Democratic capitalism allows us to do the kinds of things that are needed to produce a society with opportunity for all and with justice and peace. Democratic capitalism is a good umbrella, an umbrella under which we may construct the most successful social order ever created. The skeleton of Democratic capitalism has the ability. It is able to adapt.

The system is responsive to innovations. We are not stuck in a situation where we can look forward to going to a bankrupt treasury in the year 2000, because Social Security is there, if we do not take radical steps now to end spending for programs that benefit people.

The responsiveness is there. We can do a great deal of things under our present setup. We are the greatest system that has yet been devised by man. And we must use it with imagination and creativity. And most of all, we must have the compassion to understand that we do not need to throw any group of people overboard.

This is the first and the most vital step. Make the assumption that the richest Nation in the history of the world can create, it can generate a society which provides peace, justice and opportunity for all.

Now, am I running away from the hard job of discussing the budget? I have not mentioned very many numbers at this point. Let's talk about numbers, the problem of funding. The problem of money, of taxes, is a monumental problem today. It will be a monumental problem in the future. It is a permanent challenge. We will always have to struggle to produce the revenues necessary to finance the activities and the functions of government and society that we deem are necessary. It is an ongoing problem. We will have to rise to the occasion.

We will always have to raise revenue. We will have to eliminate waste. We have to set the right priorities. We will always have to be improving efficiency and increasing effectiveness.

Any organization or any activity that has ever been devised by human kind has a problem with efficiency and effectiveness. It has a problem with waste. The species *Homo sapiens*, human kind, is not an administering animal. We are not naturally good administrators. Administration and management is something that human beings have to work at all of the time. It is a permanent, ongoing activity.

I am not going to say that there is not waste in the welfare program. I am

not going to say there is no waste in the school lunch program. I am not going to say there is no waste in any function that is operated by government, just as there is tremendous amount of waste in the private sector. In fact, the private sector has shown us it can be the most wasteful and the most inefficient and the most corrupt sector of our society.

The savings and loans collapse, the savings and loan swindle, showed us how monumental waste and corruption and inefficiency can exist within the private sector. So mankind, homo sapiens, are no more effective in the private sector in administration and management than they are in the public sector. It is a problem that we have to confront.

Let us go forward and deal with new ways and deal with the problem of money. First, budget cuts. Am I afraid to talk about budget cuts? Do I think we should not cut the budget? There is no room in the budget for a downsizing and a decrease in expenditures? No, I would not take that position. There is a tremendous amount of waste in the budget. But we define ourselves and we show where our souls are when we make the choices as to what to cut.

Why are we going on and on, day in and day out, about the cutting of the school lunch program and there is no discussion of some cuts of the CIA and the intelligence budget? The CIA and the intelligence agencies have a secret budget. They will not even tell the American people what the budget is, yet estimates by all sources have placed it at no less than \$28 billion. The intelligence budget is no less than \$28 billion; probably more.

At a time like this in our history when there is no evil empire anymore and the Soviet Union is struggling just to exist, it cannot be an aggressor or threaten us in any way, why do we need a CIA budget of \$28 billion?

If the people who want to downsize government and want to streamline government, if they want to do it in order to give a tax cut, if they want to do it in order to make sure that our children and our grandchildren do not have to pay all of these bills in the future, if they want to seriously and sincerely deal with those problems, then why are they not discussing a cut in the CIA and the intelligence budget? Why not cut it just in half?

You put zero in the budget for the summer youth employment program. That is bold and daring. They consider that bold and daring. I think it is an act of cowardice to cut the summer youth program for teenagers overnight, pull out the money and say it is zero this year and next year it will also be zero. I do not think that is an act of courage.

It would be an act of courage to say let's gut the CIA budget and the intelligence budget in half to \$14 billion. We

will have 14 billion to distribute for these other programs or to go to the deficit or to give a contribution toward the tax cut.

CIA, who don't we cut it? Why are we discussing the school lunch program and not discussing the CIA and the intelligence agency?

Why are we discussing the school lunch program endlessly and not the *Seawolf* submarine; 2.1 plus billion dollars, \$2.1 billion to build a submarine that everybody admits we don't need at all? We don't need it to fight a war. It is only there to maintain the profits for the manufacturer at a certain level; to provide some jobs.

And if you want to take \$2.1 billion, you could provide twice as many jobs if the object is just to provide jobs. The object is to provide profits also for people who certainly do not need to be milking the American taxpayers for more profits.

So why not cut the *Seawolf* submarine? We are talking some heavy dollars when you talk about the CIA and the *Seawolf* submarine.

Why not cut the cheap electricity that that the people in the Northwest and the Midwest have from dams that are built by all of the taxpayers with all the taxpayers' money? There are some people who are paying one-half the price for electricity as my constituents are paying in New York. Do they deserve the bargain of one half the cost for their electricity? They are Americans just like everybody else. Why not market rates for everybody?

If you raise the payments of the people who are getting the bargain in electric use and raise it to market rates, and let the Federal Government take back that money that it invested in the dams and the water projects and distribute throughout all America and let us all benefit from it, let's all get a benefit of the efforts of our Federal Government. Why are we not discussing a cut or a retrieving of the bounty that the people of the Northwest and the Midwest have enjoyed all these years? People say they want government off of their backs and yet they are the beneficiaries of some of our biggest government programs for the longest number of years.

And how about the Department of Agriculture? We are not discussing the biggest welfare program in America. The longest-running and the most lucrative welfare program in America is the farm price supports.

The Department of Agriculture handed out \$16 billion plus just for farm price supports last year. Sixteen billion is about the same size as the program that feeds millions of children on welfare. But in our population, gentlemen and gentlemen, we only have a farm family population of 2 percent. Only 2 percent of the total American population is still in the classification of farmers.

Most of the billions of dollars that we are handing to the farmers or to the agribusinesses goes to corporate agricultural business. Most of it goes to rich farmers. Tremendous amounts of money could be saved if we would take the rich farmers off of welfare.

In the State of Kansas, for example, in most of the rural counties, according to the New York Times, farm families that are there and farmers who are part of the program have averaged between \$20,000 and \$40,000 a year that is being handed to them every year for doing nothing. A \$20,000 to \$40,000 check that comes on top of all of the other money that they make.

And there is no means test. When you are trying to get aid for dependent children on welfare, you have to meet a means test. You have to show you do not own anything and you have no bank account. In the Department of Agriculture programs and the farm price support programs and the Farmer's Home Loan mortgages and all of these benefits that have been heaped on our agriculture sector for the last hundred years, you do not have to show any means test.

Now, I do not want to be misunderstood. I think that the American agricultural industry is the greatest industry in America. I think it is probably one of the most effective industries in the world. There is no other nation that begins to come close to the American farmers, the American agricultural industry, in feeding its population, the population of America.

It probably could feed a large sector of the total world if the economics were different. We have the capacity. Our Department of Agriculture has done a magnificent job. And the Department of Agriculture, the whole agriculture program in America, is a sterling example of what can be done by government. Government operated from one end of the spectrum to the other.

Government funded the land-grant universities. Government funded the experimental stations for agriculture. Government funded the county agents that took the results of the experimental stations to the farmers in the field; very effective use of science and technology and for that reason, it is a hugely successful industry.

Now that agriculture is such a huge and successful industry, why are we continuing to have government play such a major role in agriculture? Why not have the government step out? They talk about abolishing the Department of Education. Why do we not downsize and streamline the Department of Agriculture? Do you know that the Department of Agriculture is the second largest bureaucracy in the Federal Government? It is second only to the Pentagon in term of the number of employees.

The Department of Agriculture, they have done a great job. It is a marvelous

success story. Private industry can now take over. We could downsize the Department of Agriculture, set a means testing procedure so that it provides aid and assistance only to the farmers who are the poorest farmers. We could privatize part of the Department of Agriculture. There are a whole set of experimental programs, there are research grants, private industry could take that research and development function at this point and do a job just as well.

So, instead of continuing to discuss on and on the school lunch program, why do we not discuss the downsizing and the streamlining of the Department of Agriculture? Why do we not discuss the elimination of \$16 billion in farm price support payments; welfare for the farmers? Why do we not deal with the farmers on the dole?

Why do we not deal with cuts of the F-22 fighter plane? Why do we need an F-22 fighter plane which was originally projected to cost the American people \$72 billion. The F-22 fighter plane is manufactured in Marietta, Georgia. The F-22 fighter plane was originally projected to cost \$72 billion. We have paid out about 12 billion already for planes and we are projecting over the next six years about \$17 billion more in expenditures for F-22 fighters.

If you want to keep America from going bankrupt, if you want to keep our grandchildren from having to pay the debt, then cut items like the F-22 fighter.

□ 2200

If you need an F-22 fighter plane, it is the most sophisticated thing ever developed in fighter planes. But do we need it? No. The second most sophisticated fighter plane we already have. We own the second most sophisticated fighter plane. We do not need to have another one more sophisticated, because we are not our own enemy. The Soviet Union is not developing any more fighter planes. They are not developing fighter planes that would even contest the one that exists already. Why keep manufacturing a brandnew one called the F-22?

So let us save over the next 6 years \$17 billion that could be applied then to fund the Summer Youth Employment Program, to make certain there is no shortfall in the School Lunch Program, to make certain we do not kick people out of nursing homes, to guarantee that we do not remove home care from people in great need. Let us go forward and examine all of these expenditures if we really are sincerely interested in the most effective and efficient budget.

Mr. Speaker, this is a simple discussion, and I hope the American people are listening closely. Listen to the numbers. In addition to philosophy, it is very important that we understand the numbers. The numbers that are being poured into the defense budget

are huge numbers: \$17 billion more for F-22 fighters, \$2.1 billion for another Seawolf submarine; \$28 billion for the CIA; B-2 bombers. We could go on. The majority in this House want to spend another \$50 billion for defense. The majority in this House want to spend another \$50 billion for defense, while they are telling us they must trim school lunches and they must make more efficient programs like Medicare and Medicaid.

Finally, we have new revenue options. Our vision, the caring majority vision versus the vision of the oppressive elite majority. Their vision is we are in a situation where America is on the verge of bankruptcy. To hear the elite, the oppressive elite minority Members talk, we are almost at the stage of Bangladesh. We cannot exist much longer if we continue to try to build a society which is there for everybody. We have to start dumping people overboard. We have to rein in the safety net. Even Ronald Reagan acknowledged that there is a safety net that is needed, that we are now about to dump. The high technology barbarians who are in charge now have no compassion for those people.

Yet, every day there are new developments which show that far from being bankrupt and far from having our resources exhausted, America, the Democratic capitalistic society, America has all kinds of new potential for producing revenues.

We have just realized \$9 billion by selling invisible frequency bands in the sky. Spectrums in the sky which you cannot even see have been sold to the tune of \$9 billion, and that process has not ended. By just selling the air over ourselves, we have made money. And in the future, of course, we can always tax the income that is made off of those operations as normally the profits are going to be taxed, any profits made. So we have generated out of nothing. It shows you do not need land. You can take the air and sell it. If you are a nation, the power of nationhood is that you own the air.

They used to own the land, and we have given away a lot of the land. That is a chapter in American history which was very successful. You gave away land, you produced free enterprise, and you made great millionaires and produced a middle class. We have done a lot of great things in the past. We have given away too much in some cases. We have given away property that had minerals on it, up until very recently. We are still giving away property that has gold on it and we do not require that the people who mine the gold pay us a royalty and give us back some of the benefits of the lands that the Government and the people own. The people have to assert themselves, and the people are going to have to insist there can be no more nonsense on giving away public lands and not demanding

that the public have some percentage of the profits realized from the minerals that we get from those public lands.

We could also gain more revenue if we would stop giving away the fruits of Federal and government research. Military research has spawned a whole host of hundreds of new products. We have not reached out and placed the royalty on those products to come back to the public Treasury. We have just given it away.

Many of you know, everybody knows of a few products. Television was really perfected by our government research, not just the famous product super glue, which everybody knows was developed by the space program. There are hundreds of products that were produced as a result of government research, and we, the people, who paid the bill to do the research, we get no benefit from those products. That is a source of revenue. We could reach out, and instead of worrying about going bankrupt and putting the elderly on the streets, out of nursing homes, cutting back on Medicaid and Medicare, cutting back on school lunch programs, let us be more creative about claiming what belongs to the people.

I am not in favor of new taxes on income. I am not in favor of new personal taxes. But there are ways to get revenue that we ought to closely examine, which have nothing to do with personal income taxes. There are all kinds of loopholes. At a later date we are going to list those loopholes. The Congressional Black Caucus' alternative budget, we intend to close the loopholes that corporations live by in order to maximize their profits and escape paying a just share of the taxes. Corporate taxes, the share of the overall revenue burden borne by corporate taxes, has dropped drastically in the last 20 years. We need to get back to having the corporate world carry their share of the taxes.

I am going to yield in a few minutes to a colleague of mine, but I want to make it clear that we are talking about the overall program of the new majority in Congress. We are talking about the fact that the budget process, the rescissions that are now being made right now, the budget that is going to be brought to the floor in May, all of that is part of an overall grand design that is a design, of course, a distorted vision of America, being driven by high-tech barbarians who have no compassion and are really on the wrong track when they conclude we cannot have an America which is for everybody. Contrasted with their position, the position of the oppressive elite minority is a position of the caring majority. We are going to produce a budget, the Congressional Black Caucus is going to produce a budget, which reflects a vision of the caring majority.

To talk more about budgets and the rescissions that are now at our doorstep, heartless, cruel decisions that are being made through this rescission process, is my colleague from Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE].

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Let me thank my colleague from New York, MAJOR OWENS, and thank him for a very reasoned, if you will, detailed presentation, and almost a journey, if you will, taking us through very evenly how we have wound up to be here on the House floor, and poised, if you will, to vote for a rescissions bill that is larger than any I have ever seen and I think this House has ever seen.

Congressman, you know the last rescissions bill was in 1981. It is interesting, as you have been speaking about the cuts, and I just simply had to join you because as I have reviewed this legislation, the fact that it hits at the very most vulnerable in our society gives me a great deal of discomfort.

Interestingly enough, we are at 5.4 percent in unemployment. The economy is going well. You made a very good point about tax cuts and whether or not those who would be classified as Democrats are against improving the economy or looking at tax cuts.

We are looking at, are concerned about being fair. I took time for a moment to just find out what the word "rescission" means in Webster's dictionary. It is an act of rescinding, to take away, to take back, annul, cancel, to make void by action of the enacting authority or the superior authority.

That is what we have. We have a negative. We have a taking away of something already authorized. We have a taking back. We have an annulling. We have a canceling, and we have a superior attitude against the children of this country, against the elderly of this country, against those who need affordable housing.

We seem to want to pull back from the States of this country after, I remember, a very extensive debate about unfunded mandates, and many were called upon to support this legislation as innovative and positive. But yet this legislation will clearly put on the cities and States the great needs of its people, and that is the need to in fact serve those who are most vulnerable.

If I might just simply say that the rescissions bill, as it is politely known, will cut to the bone many of the programs that you have just spoken about. Across the country, throughout my home State and right in my hometown of Houston, millions of children, elderly and poor citizens will be devastated and forced to endure government-sanctioned hardships in order to provide extensive tax cuts.

Well, what does this boil down to? As though the unsettling dynamics and displacement of our rapidly changing global economy were not already bad

enough when it comes to driving the widening wedge between America's economic haves and have-nots, now the have-nots have to worry about Uncle Sam cutting them off at the knees. I do not know what we are going to do, but I will simply share with my Republican colleagues who are constantly explaining that what they are doing is helping America.

Just read the headlines in the hometown papers like the Houston Chronicle that says "Do Not Short-Change Texas Children." These are not political activists who are seeking publicity. These are children advocates who realize that Texas alone has some 7.3 percent of the U.S. child population. It has a large number of the individuals that are infants, I think some 5 million or so children.

We have headlines from local papers saying "Do Not Play Politics with Hungry Children," from the El Paso Times. These are local people that are speaking. The GOP social agenda is flawed at best. Local people again.

We have got "The Republican Tax Cut Plan May Not Add Up." We know that it does not add up, because clearly it tends to take from those who can least afford it. That is why we are in trouble with school lunches and breakfasts, but more important, that is why we are in trouble with school-to-work programs and no summer jobs.

Here is one right out the mouths of Republican Congresspersons, "GOP Haste Laying Waste to Legislative Good Intentions." This is not the Democrats speaking, this is the Republicans. One Republican stated, "I have always been a little concerned about arbitrary deadlines. I do not think it contributes to sound legislating."

Well, it really has not, because it is helping those who need help the most.

So I think that we are moving toward hurting our children, and we are moving toward not even ensuring that children and workers and those who are in need can be best served.

But if we fancy ourselves a moral Nation, ought we not first look for efficiencies and cuts in programs and policies that generally serve the fortunate who have been blessed, and from whom a small sacrifice for the good of the whole would not be an undue burden?

Let me share with you the words of the late Hubert Humphrey, who was fond of reminding us of the moral litmus test.

Those who are in the dawn of life, the children, those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly, and those who are in the shadow of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

Mr. Speaker and my colleague, I wonder if anyone from the other side of the aisle can in good conscience claim that this rescission package, taking back, canceling, does anyone any good.

This package cuts \$17 billion, and it is a package. These cuts are not to the

mohair growers subsidy or tax break on vacation home mortgages. But they simply get at the crux of those who are in need.

Let me just simply tell you where they are coming from. Where do the GOP cuts come from? My colleague ably detailed for us. Here it is in graphic design, if you will. Sixty-three percent comes from low-income cuts, individuals who are in need, and then 37 percent from other cuts. It gets to the people who most are in need.

Where is the justice in this rescission plan when 69 percent of the so-called savings will go to pay for tax cuts at a time when the deficits are already too high?

We wonder about the tax-and-spend liberals. That is what folks have been calling those who are not listening. What about the borrow-and-spend Republican administrations that have quadrupled our debt?

It is important to recognize that we have a job to do here in the United States Congress, and, therefore, it is a shame that we are canceling out housing, 42 percent, work experience and job training, 14 percent, health, 10 percent, education, 9 percent, and 25 percent in other cuts. People who are simply looking for the opportunity that we say in this country we are giving them.

Then I might add, as we begin to look elsewhere, we find that we have got some 69 percent tax cuts. That is where the money is going, and then of course it is going to the FEMA relief. I am not speaking about those States that are in great need, and need this kind of aid.

We know that California has been in some severe bad weather at this time, but we would simply say, what about those who are in need for hunger and housing? What about those who are trying to make a better life? Do we not need to be of assistance to them?

Mr. OWENS. Would the gentlewoman yield for a minute?

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. OWENS. I would like to underscore what the gentlewoman has just said. I wonder if the American people realize the tremendous amount of money they have given to take care of natural disasters over the past 3 or 4 years. For the hurricane in Florida, between \$6 billion and \$7 billion of taxpayers' money from all over America went to help the victims of the hurricane in Florida. The earthquake in California, floods, mud slides, we are talking about close to \$7 billion or \$8 billion just directed to California various natural disasters. The Midwest flood that took place a couple of years ago, \$6 billion of people from all over the country's money went to help take care of those disasters.

We recognize people who are the victims of natural disasters are in need and therefore we come to their aid, and it is altogether fitting and proper for government to do this. But the people

in our big cities who are the victims of a mismanaged economy which does not provide any jobs also have great needs and we ought to also look upon them in the same way and provide some kind of assistance on an ongoing basis without having to have these frequent reviews and without belittling people who are the victims of the economy and victims of the mismanagement of the economy.

We are all one people, and there is no reason why one kind of disaster and one kind of victimization should be treated in a different way from the other people who are also victims.

I hope we will take not of that. It is an involuntary stimulus. California did not make the earthquake happen but once the earthquake happened, they got an involuntary economic stimulus. Money was poured in to take care of that need. It also made the economy go again. That is just the way it happens. But we also have disasters of a different kind in our big cities, whether they are Houston, New York, or Newark, New Jersey. I just wanted to underscore that point.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. The gentleman could not be more right, and he has made a very eloquent point. I wonder as the American people go about their business and some have said that this debate has caused a great deal of distortion. I think the American people are smarter than what we would give credit for, and, that is, appreciating the fact, again, that the government went into these places like Florida and California, and, by the way, they went into my State, the State of Texas, and in fact there are people in my community right now who are still in great need because of a very severe flood we had in early fall, and I am working to ensure that they can be made whole.

But if you can appreciate that kind of assistance from the Federal Government, then why do we hear from the Republicans how easy it is to cut now some \$17 billion from the devastation that occurs in people's lives, especially that they have been challenged to pick yourself up, get off welfare, become independent, and I can assure you, just like I am sure in your community, that I have met with welfare mothers.

We sat down at the table and broke bread together and talked about their life. There was not a one that either got pregnant because they were getting a welfare check, there was a one that wanted to be on welfare. They talked about self-esteem, they talked about getting a job, they talked about trying to be independent. That is lives that are devastated, people responsible for children, and they need the help of the Federal Government.

If I could just share with you for one moment to tell you how much we are hurting in Texas.

Mr. OWENS. If the gentlewoman would yield for a moment, I want to in-

quire of the Chair how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS). The gentleman has 8 minutes remaining.

Mr. OWENS. I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas and I will take the last 4 minutes. I just wanted to close out with a note and I neglected to put in before.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. See how good it is to be able to have time and it is also good to be able to share with those who are in need, and that is the problem we have here in the State of Texas.

This is a gentleman who has no ax to grind. He is our State comptroller, and he has already assessed that we lose about a billion dollars in this rescission package for the State of Texas. We lose some \$763.7 million in Medicaid. Therefore, those who are trying to get off welfare would not have health care, the elderly, the severely handicapped, 69 percent. Family nutrition programs, we are losing \$170.6 million, 15.5 percent, for our State.

Then there is AFDC, there is training, emergency assistance, 10 percent, we are losing \$118.6 million. Then school nutrition in particular, dealing with our school lunches and school breakfasts. By the way, I met with leaders of the local school community and they are just up in arms about the children who will come to their doors who are hungry, particularly the districts that serve at-risk children. We are talking about the national impact, but I know what it means. It is going to hurt the people in the State of Texas, people in the State of New York, people all over this country. The American people understand this. This rescissions package should go nowhere.

As I conclude, let me talk about, and you have worked so hard on the summer programs, summer job perhaps that I have been actively involved in in my community. We are getting ready to lose in FY 1995 and 1996, \$66.6 million in 1995 and \$66.9 million, 43,000 jobs each year, and in Houston, each year, 1995 and 1996, 6,000 jobs. It was already not enough just last summer, 8,000 youngsters showed up on the first day to sign up, with stories of pain and excitement at the same time, excitement of trying to get a job, and pain for the need of the money during the summer months, for rent for their families, for clothing for their families, to take care of younger brothers and sisters.

This is serious. I worked extensively with anti-gang measures in Houston, where there are some 3,000 gang members, drive-by shootings. This is what gets our children off the street. This is what prepares young adults for the 21st century, the opportunity to work. This changes their mind set.

So when we begin to talk about where we are today and your detailing of what we should be looking at with an alternative budget and fairly we can

look at possibly tax cuts, possibly downsizing different agencies, we do not reject that, I do not reject it. But I do reject taking from the most vulnerable and undermining a State that is trying so very hard to improve itself and to serve the people in that community. We must be the better one, the Federal Government, to be able to stand up with the moral fiber and fight for those who are in need.

I thank the gentleman from New York but I think that we must cancel out this rescissions package and ensure that we stand up against this kind of intrusion into the lives of American citizens.

Mr. OWENS. I thank the gentlewoman from Texas. I would like to underscore your last point. The defunding, the placing of zero in the budget for the summer youth employment project is probably one of the most cruel and dangerous and deadliest acts of this oppressive elite minority in control of the Congress now. It shows no vision. It betrays the very vital segment of our population that needs help the most.

They follow through on that, that zeroing the budget for the summer youth employment program with a \$210 million rescission of the National Service Program. The National Service Program is for a different set of youth but it is basically program-oriented toward young people.

The National Service Program is not a program of Bill Clinton, it is not a program that the Democrats fabricated 2 years ago and the Republicans stood on the sideline. I have been in Congress for almost 13 years and we have discussed a National Service Program for 10 of those 13 years. Both parties have come forward with proposals, both parties have worked together. Why do we all of a sudden have to throw overboard and destroy a program which it took 10 years of deliberation and planning to develop?

The National Service Program would receive rescissions of \$210 million out of the \$571 million that they have available for this fiscal year. That is taking \$210 million and leaving only \$365 million, crippling the program to such an extent that it would hardly be able to operate because it is just getting off the ground now.

And then there are bigger cuts coming in the budget that begins October 1 because the oppressive minority has made it quite clear that they want to destroy the National Service Program.

The American people have a right to know why. Why? We should challenge the high-technology barbarians and say, You cannot do reckless things like this, you cannot make reckless decisions, you cannot just disregard all reason without explaining to the American people why.

A rescission of this magnitude for the National Service Program would renege on the bipartisan congressional

commitment of Americans who have already committed to serving their communities. Middle-class families who work hard and play by the rules would be especially hard hit because many of the members of the AmeriCorps are middle class. We designed it so it would not just be a program where young people who are poor were involved. It cuts across all classes.

A year and a half ago, Congress mandated a 3-year phase-in for funding 100,000 AmeriCorps members. It called for 20,000 members to begin a year of service in 1994 and 33,000 in fiscal year 1995.

This rescission, this heartless rescission, would require the corporation to scale back existing programs already in place, cutting approximately 2,000 AmeriCorps members from the current level of 20,000 and 15,000 from the phase-in level which has already been authorized by Congress. The majority of those reductions would occur in those States with the most AmeriCorps members: New York, California, Texas, Pennsylvania, and Michigan.

Middle-class families with college-age members willing to serve their communities full-time for a full year who are counting on AmeriCorps to help them afford college educations would be especially hard hit if the congressional commitment is not kept.

We close with National Service, as just one more example. School lunch programs, summer youth employment programs, National Service programs, programs that would benefit all of America a great deal are being very hard hit by these heartless cuts.

On the other hand, the F-22 fighter plane is not touched, and neither is the Seawolf submarine and a huge number of other programs in the military budget.

I want to thank the gentlewoman for joining me, and I hope that Americans are listening. There is a vision offered by the oppressive elite minority and there is a vision offered by the caring majority. We will talk more about those visions in the future.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak unequivocally against the misguided, shortsighted, and unconscionable spending cuts proposed in H.R. 1158—the Republican rescissions bill—to be considered on the House floor on Wednesday and Thursday of this week.

This rescissions bill, as it is politely known, will cut to the bone many programs that manage to maintain a minimal standard of living and health care for America's most vulnerable citizens.

Across the country, throughout my home State of Texas, and right in my hometown of Houston, millions of children, elderly, and poor citizens will be devastated and forced to endure Government-sanctioned hardships in order to provide extensive tax cuts.

That's what it boils down to, Mr. Speaker.

As though the unsettling dynamics and displacement of our rapidly changing, highly com-

petitive global economy were not already bad enough when it comes to driving the widening wedge between America's economic haves and have-nots.

Now, the have-nots have to worry about Uncle Sam cutting them off at the knees.

What in the world have we come to?

How can those Americans, who enjoy some of the highest living standards in human history, possibly begin to justify their demand for tax cuts when fellow citizens, through no fault of their own, are relegated to lives of bare subsistence and, in many cases, much less than that?

How can Republicans rationalize rescissions, while at the same time proposing to reduce spending on the hugely successful, bipartisan WIC Program that for better than two decades has been providing basic, healthful nutrition for poor women, infants, and children?

While economists and sociologists of all political stripes are telling us that, to succeed in the information age of the 21st century, American workers must be better trained and educated than the once-celebrated production-line workers of the 20th century, how can Republicans tell us—with a straight face—that we ought to be slashing job training and education programs that serve both children and adults?

How will the Republican leadership explain to senior citizens living in our colder climates that the Low-Income-Heating Assistance Program [LIHEAP] that has helped them pay their heating bills in the winter is being cut?

Though it's not politically popular to do so these days, I might remind this body that American tax burdens—for all income brackets—have been and remain among the very lowest of the industrialized, Western democracies.

Should American government at all levels continue to improve efficiency, cut spending for outmoded programs, and work very hard to keep taxes as low as possible? . . . Absolutely.

But, if we fancy ourselves a moral nation, ought we not first look for efficiencies and cuts in programs and policies that generally serve the fortunate who have been blessed and from whom a small sacrifice for the good of the whole would not be an undue burden?

The late Hubert Humphrey was fond of reminding us that the moral test of any government was in the way it treated "those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life—the sick, the needy, and the handicapped."

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if anyone from the other side of the aisle can in good conscience claim that their rescission proposals pass such moral muster.

I don't know how they could, Mr. Speaker, when their cold-hearted proposals call for more than \$17 billion of cuts.

And these cuts are not to mohair grower subsidies or tax breaks on vacation home mortgages.

No, Mr. Speaker, these cuts to the bone come from programs like child nutrition, public housing, basic health care, education, transportation and community development—all programs that the most needy among us depend on for a brighter future.

Who takes the hit from these Republican spending cuts?

The answer is clear.

According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, a whopping 63 percent of the GOP cuts—nearly \$11 billion in fiscal year 1995—will impact low-income Americans.

And where does the money go?

Well, Mr. Speaker, 31 percent does go to help citizens who have lost their homes and communities due to natural disasters like earthquakes and hurricanes, and few would argue that the Government should not assist these victims.

But what about the victims of our man-made disasters like inadequate urban and rural schools; like job flight from our inner cities; like employment, housing and banking discrimination?

Are we not similarly obligated, Mr. Speaker, to assist these citizens, as well?

Where is the justice in this rescission plan when 69 percent of the so-called savings will go to pay for tax cuts at a time when deficits are already too high?

But it is disingenuous for GOP leadership to blame "tax-and-spend-liberals" for all America's financial woes when in fact it was during 12 years of "borrow-and-spend" Republican administrations that our national debt quadrupled.

Mr. Speaker, both parties and both the President and Congress can share equally in the blame for our sorry status quo.

But we're not going to get anywhere, much less rebuild a solid foundation for America's future by polarizing and dividing its citizens.

To blame poor people for all our problems just to curry political favor is shortsighted, immoral, and potentially catastrophic.

How will we pay for the additional medical care that will be needed by children made sick due to lack of nutrition?

How will we provide for families made homeless due to cuts in public housing? Almost 25,000 families remain on waiting lists in my city—Houston, TX.

How will we protect ourselves from those who may turn to crime when denied educational opportunities and a real chance in the mainstream economy?

My colleagues from the other side are fond of their "dynamic budget scoring" that tries to predict future Government revenues based on the boost they think their tax cuts will give to the economy.

Well, what's good for the goose, Mr. Speaker . . .

Ought not my Republican colleagues be prepared to score their spending cuts in the same fashion?

Shouldn't we think intelligently about the medium- and long-term effects these rescissions will have on future budgets and on the very moral fiber of our American society?

So as not to be accused of undue hyperbole or attempting to govern by anecdote, I'd like to share with my colleagues and the American people some clinical analysis of the GOP rescission plan.

I represent the people of Houston in the 18th Congressional District of Texas.

So in addition to looking at national figures for these rescission cuts, I'd like to start with this story from last Wednesday's Houston Chronicle.

"Funding Cuts Could Cost Texas Billions, Comptroller Warns" . . .

That's the headline of the story which goes on to quote Texas State Comptroller John Sharp.

Sharp foresees up to \$1.1 billion in cuts in four critical categories in the next 2 years that would devastate needy people in Houston and throughout the State.

Let us examine some of the specific programs that would be cut under this bill.

One program that is critically important to young people is the Youth Summer Jobs Program. This program, which began 30 years ago, has worked very well and has always received bipartisan support.

Nevertheless, this rescission bill completely eliminates funding in fiscal year 1995 and fiscal year 1996 for the Summer Jobs Program to the tune of \$1.6 billion nationwide.

During this 2-year period, more than 1.2 million kids in 650 communities will be left without summer jobs.

And without question, these jobs are extremely important to young people. In many instances, these jobs give them their first job opportunity and help them develop a good working ethic.

In addition, many young people use the money earned from these jobs to buy clothes and supplies for school.

Let us be clear about the effectiveness of this program . . . the Summer Jobs Program consists of real jobs, not "make-work" jobs.

In many cities and towns, no other jobs are available for young people. As I travel around my congressional district and around the country, teenage unemployment remains high—particularly in African-American and Latino communities.

We need the Summer Jobs Program now more than ever.

Let's look at how the elimination of this program will affect Texas and Houston. The State of Texas will lose \$66 million in fiscal year 1995 and nearly \$67 million in fiscal year 1996.

This translates into 43,000 summer jobs that will be lost in Texas in each of the 2 years.

During this period, the city of Houston will lose \$9.1 million in 1995 and 1996 and will lose 12,000 jobs over this 2-year period.

I urge my colleagues to preserve this program and continue providing adequate funding.

Another program that will experience a major reduction in spending under this bill is housing.

This bill makes a frontal assault on the poor and our Nation's cities. One program, the Community Development Block Grant Program, will suffer a spending reduction of \$350 million nationwide.

The CDBG Program is one of the largest sources of Federal assistance to States and local governments.

Most of this money is channeled directly to the local level, particularly metropolitan areas with large pockets of poverty and substandard housing stock.

These funds have been used to acquire and rehabilitate property, preserve historic structures, provide relocation assistance and enforce housing code violations.

For example, the State of Texas will lose \$19.9 million in community development block

grant funds and the city of Houston will lose \$2.4 million.

Under this bill, public housing programs have also been targeted for major reductions. Funds for public housing modernization will be cut by \$36 million in Texas and \$3.8 million in Houston.

The State of Texas will also lose \$14.2 million in public housing operating subsidies while the city of Houston will lose \$1.9 million.

Decent and affordable housing for all Americans—families and individuals—is a basic building block for communities and our society at large.

We can no longer delay making housing a national and moral priority.

Health care for the poor is another area that will suffer greatly under this bill.

In addition to the unthinkable cuts to Medicaid—more than \$760 million in 2 years for Texas alone—I am most concerned by cuts to the National Health Service Corps.

This program is designed to award scholarships to students in the health professions in exchange for their agreement to spend 2 to 3 years in medically underserved areas.

Over the last 25 years, this program has helped meet the health care needs of millions of low-income Americans.

This GOP rescissions bill proposes a \$12.5 million cut in this program.

Through this program, the Community Health Center in Houston, known as Central Houston Action, and several projects at the Harris County Hospital District will be endangered.

There are currently 62 physicians in Texas who are participating in the National Health Service Corps . . . and it seems to me we ought to be looking to expand this program, not cut it.

Members of the last Congress chose not to undertake constructive health care reform . . . it remains to be seen whether or not this Congress will muster the political courage to try.

In the meantime, however, how can we possibly consider making cuts to one small program that we know works in bringing affordable, basic health services to millions of Americans in under-served regions?

Mr. Speaker, in many cases, the lives of these needy Americans literally hang in the balance.

I could go on all night citing other programs marked for cuts that have similarly critical impacts on millions of American lives and livelihoods.

And I could complain about the closed nature of debate my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have employed with this bill and others thus far in this 104th Congress.

I could complain in detail about the amendments we Democrats sought to offer in an effort to protect vulnerable Americans, only to have them blocked out-of-hand by the Republican majority.

But I'll simply conclude, Mr. Speaker, with a final, heartfelt plea to all my colleagues with a conscience and a greater sense of obligation to America's future than that evidenced by the cuts in H.R. 1158.

I urge my colleagues to vote against this pernicious piece of legislation.

□ 2230

#### CLICHES AND THEMES IN POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to continue the colloquy begun 2 weeks ago with the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH] and, Mr. Speaker, you will recall that during that colloquy we talked about themes in politics and cliches in politics and the unfortunate fact that politics in America in the 1990's has become theme-driven.

You hear often the phrase, "They don't get it." Well, the problem, Mr. Speaker, is "They don't get it," so now the American taxpayer is going to get it, and I hope that what we have heard on this floor tonight and what we have heard in this country over the last few months has received the attention of the American people, because the American people, I think, need to hear what the opposition is saying about the Contract With America and the importance of themes like personal responsibility, stopping the micro management of the private sector from Washington, a return to true free enterprise in this country that runs throughout the Contract With America.

It seems the loyal opposition truly believes government does it better, and we on this side of the aisle sincerely believe individuals do it better, Mr. Speaker.

This new Congress is made up of people who are willing to take a stand, who are willing to challenge accepted assumptions in this country for the last 40 years, and as a result of the Contract With America, what do we get? We get stories about the 1950's, about Governors from the 1950's, about the fact you can no longer trust States in the 1950's, in the 1960's, in the 1970's, in the 1980's, in the 1990's. You just cannot trust the States.

We get gross misrepresentations of fact. We get misinformation. We get horror stories. We get phony numbers. We get scarce tactics. And, I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], we get class warfare, because class warfare is the bottom line. It is what we hear time and time again, hour after hour, day after day, week after week on the floor of this House.

And an example is the School Lunch Program. Just this week, a few quotes: A Boston Globe columnist wrote that the country is simply not too broke to feed poor schoolchildren. The food services director in Omaha, NE, for the west side community schools of Omaha, said it is unconscionable to allow more of our children to suffer from hunger in addition to the 12 million who do now; health and nutrition are not a priority in Washington, she

alleged, quoting a Government estimate. She said school lunch funding would be cut by 17 percent.

Now, on the floor of this House, we have seen the real numbers tonight. We have seen the real numbers every day in the newspaper. The real numbers, Mr. Speaker, are that nutrition programs have been funded at a level \$4.3 billion for fiscal year 1994; under the Republican budget, they are projected to increase to \$6.78 billion in 1996, and to increase further to \$7.8 billion in the year 2000.

By eliminating the administrative costs, by cutting out the Federal middleman, by cutting out the Federal micromanager, we are giving more money to the States for nutrition programs. Those are the numbers. Those are the facts. And by the way, they are the true facts getting through to the American people, because the message coming from towns and cities and districts and counties and the people across this country back to Washington today is, "We are not buying that old class warfare anymore."

I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. RADANOVICH], I know you would like to comment on that, and I yield.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Thank you, I say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH], for yielding.

I guess the point I think that needs to be made in what is happening on the floor of this House, the changes that the new majority, the Republican Party, is wanting to make is that which is a return to local control and privatization of what we are doing right here in Washington right now, and I think that some of the basic messages of those who so desire a strong central government that reaches in and controls the lives of so many people is the basic message is you cannot trust anybody else but those on the floor of this House including the 2 of us, but not excluding 433 other Members of this House.

And I guess my comment is that, and to reinforce what the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] is saying, is that government is best done at the local level, and problem-solving is best done at the local level. I can take care of things much better in my district much better than the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHRLICH] could, because he probably has never been to Fresno, probably has never been to my hometown.

Mr. EHRLICH. I intend to visit this year.

Mr. RADANOVICH. You will be there someday. But you have never been. But nobody knows my problems better than I do, and I believe nobody can solve my problems better than those elected officials in my district who are on the local and State level, and I think that in reference to the reference by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. EHR-

LICH] to class warfare, it seems to be the defense of those who defend a strong central Federal Government that whenever people like us who are elected and come in and try to solve that problem, we get accused of being in favor of class warfare, being against the poor, being against the middle class, being for the rich, and I am a Republican, and, "I ain't rich."

But those seem to be the arguments that are posed here, and I cannot help but go back to two things. First is, there is a deep mistrust of local elected officials on behalf of the Democratic leadership, and there is also, in order to defend what they see as solving problems from a strong Federal Government, where if we raise your taxes a little bit more we just get a little bit more money in the Federal till, we will be able to solve welfare, we will be able to solve the dilemma of so many women becoming pregnant, unmarried mothers, we will be able to solve it, we will just spend a little bit more money on it. Implicit in that is a recurring theme that only the Federal Government can have empathy for poor people.

Mr. EHRLICH. Right. And only the Federal Government knows best what people need, not just the poor, but middle-class, working-class Americans.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Exactly. You know, I think there are probably 435 very caring people here, but I would not exclude it to us. I mean, there are thousands of elected officials out there that take their commitment to their public office just as seriously as you and I, and maybe more seriously than some people in this body. I do not see any reason why they cannot be trusted with more responsibility and, frankly, that is what this is all about.

Mr. EHRLICH. I agree. The horror stories we hear, the horror stories that we have heard, regardless of the issue, fill in the issue, there is a horror story that we hear put out night after night on the floor of this House.

The regulatory, just going back 2 weeks, with respect to the regulatory reforms that we have enacted, the regulatory moratorium bill, cost-benefit analysis, risk analysis, paperwork reduction, private property rights, we heard the same horror stories then as we hear now. Forget the issue, if it is part of the Contract With America, it is horrific, it is bad, it is anti-working people it is anti-poor.

And there again, we see the analogy, the class warfare time and time again.

The gentleman will recall that with respect to this whole issue of regulatory power, micromanagement from the Federal Government, I talked 2 weeks ago about the Department of Labor and the fact that the Department of Labor has made enforcement of child labor laws a top priority over the past several years. In particular, grocers, grocery store owners all over

the country are being cited for violations of hazardous occupation order No. 12 which we discussed 2 weeks ago, and that order prohibits employees under the age of 18 from operating or assisting to operate balers, machines used to compact used cardboard. Inspectors routinely go to such lengths as issuing citations based on responses to questionnaires mailed to former employees. That is how bad it has gotten in this country today.

DOL recently decided, without seeking public comment, without seeking comment from the people impacted by this regulation, they recently decided that compactors are covered under HO 12 the same way that balers are covered. Therefore, no employee under age 18 is allowed to load or operate a baler or compactor.

Now, the history of this particular order is quite interesting. HO 12 was adopted in 1954 under authority of the Fair Labor Standards Act. Its rationale was based on a 1954, 40 year, 41 years ago report entitled "Operation of Paper Products Machines" that assessed the danger to teenagers of operating certain machinery used in the paper industry. The section on balers was based on a type of machinery used on a type of machine that was common in the paper industry back then. But it is far removed from the ones used in today's modern grocery stores.

HO 12 has never been updated to reflect the changes brought about by safety advances. Today's balers bear very little resemblance to the huge machines of 41 years ago, when HO 12 was issued.

The most serious injury assumed by the 1954 DOL report, and I quote, "for a person's arm to be caught by the descending plunger should someone else operate the control mechanism, \* \* \* could only happen with balers of that era, 41 years ago," which did not have loading chamber doors, so the accidents could occur. They cannot occur today, yet we have a regulation that lives forever, and, of course, as we have discussed in the past in our first colloquy, that seems to be the whole idea behind bureaucracy and regulation; once you create a bureaucracy, a governmental bureaucracy or a new regulation, it lives forever.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Beyond that, it is a process of justification. Then those in the bureaucracy have to justify their existence so they will come up with new programs that are less and less applicable to the real world.

Mr. EHRLICH. And more money.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And more money. I have got an example, too, if I may. This is on the eating disorders of pigeons. There is a million dollars spent on discussing the eating disorders of pigeons. I will tell you, if I had an endangered species person, I was a pigeon, and had an endangered species person following me around day to day, watching everything I did, I would have an

eating disorder, too. These are things, again, another example of how when you get a centralized government that is far removed from reality in the day-to-day business, you begin to get things that are unapplicable and have no sense to our daily lives.

Now, I am not against research, you know, of one kind or another, but I think what you get after awhile is stuff that is not applicable to reality, and I think that that is basically the problem that we are facing right now.

Those that are criticizing what the Republicans are doing in the House right now in the Contract With America, with the goals of achieving privatization and local control, in my mind, have a real hard time. I would be embarrassed, frankly, if I had to defend the system that we have here in Washington right now, and yet it seems to me that with the Democratic leadership on the other side of the aisle, or however you are supposed to say it, I would be embarrassed to defend what Washington does right now, rather than saying, "Let's both agree that what is going on is wrong right now. Let's both come up with plans, and let's introduce them on the floor and go back with new ideas." Who on Earth would want to have to defend what Washington is doing right now?

It is a ludicrous system back here that is bankrupting America, enslaving the lives of poor, unfortunate people who do not know better, under a system that is just doling out money. And, you know, frankly, I think that the Federal Government is such a poor substitute for personal responsibility that I would be embarrassed to be sitting on this floor defending all of the things that the Federal Government does right now.

□ 2245

But that is all we hear. That is all we hear, and it has been interesting for us who just arrived here 70 days ago, 10 weeks ago, to hear the defense of the welfare state we hear time and time again on the floor of this House. And the fact is, and it is an observation that many of us have discussed privately, there are no ideas. There are no new ideas. There are no new initiatives across the aisle. It is the same old stuff and the American people rejected it on November 8 and they are rejecting it in March 1995 and they are going to reject it in July 1995 and they are going to reject it in 1996.

Mr. RADANOVICH. I would like to make a point too at this particular stage and that is, a lot of what you hear on the other side of the aisle from their leadership is, when our party was in the minority, we resorted to a lot of hit tactics of their leadership. We did a lot of things that they didn't like, and now they are going to turn around and do it to us, as thinking that in some means by doing that they are going to get back the majority of the House.

My point is, I think that whatever the party did before I got here is fine, but I tell you, the only reason why I am here today and the only reason we are in the majority is not because we took hits to the then majority, but because we went before the American people with a plan and we said, listen, this is what we are going to do. We promise that we will do these things 1 through 10. You send us to Washington, we will do it.

Now, if that is the case and I believe it to be, gosh darn it, come up with your plan. Stop hitting, stop defending a miserable losing system that we have here in Washington right now.

Mr. EHRLICH. That is a wonderful point, a great lead-in to my next point, because we were not here. We have heard the stories about how the former minority, the present majority, was treated.

And let me relay your observation to the tort reform debate that occurred on this floor last week, and as you well know, Republicans are of different minds with respect to individual initiatives under the rubric of tort reform. But the fact is, the Democrat majority never allowed real tort reform measures to be brought to the floor of this House ever, and the American people demanded it and the Democrat majority said no, it is not important.

And what the new Republican majority did last week was bring very important initiatives to the floor of this House in the way of legal reform.

Now, as the gentleman knows, I opposed the loser pays provision, but I supported the securities litigation reform, the joint and several liability reform, punitive damages, the products liability reforms. These are reforms that the American public is demanding today. And what the Democrats seem to conveniently forget is they never allowed this debate to occur, and that is the whole idea behind the contract.

The whole idea behind the contract is not that 230 Republicans agree with every plank of the contract, but it was, we have a deal with the American people, a contract with the American people and we promise to bring these important initiatives to the floor of this House to debate them honestly, in substantive terms, so that the people of America can see a party that knows how to run the place and to restore that sense of pride and respectability that we saw the American people have lost when it comes to this institution, and I believe we have begun to do that, and the fact that we have begun to regenerate that pride is reflected in the poll results.

Getting back to tort reform and this whole theme that we are talking about, they do not get it, and a lack of individual initiative and individual pride, there is a psychology in this country, and I know the gentleman as a businessman suffers as a result of this psy-

chology, and that psychology basically is, if some real or perceived ill befalls me at any point in society, well, there has to be a legal cause of action, there has to be a remedy, there has to be a bureaucrat to make you feel better, there has to be a regulation, and there has to be money in my pocket and it is costing all of us billions of dollars.

Now, many of us on this side know, and the American people know, there are legitimate plaintiffs in civil cases and they deserve, in some cases, major awards. But the fact is, this foundation that I am owed something, that if something happens to me, I have to have a lawyer, I have to file a lawsuit, I have to get the money, somebody has to pay for it, it goes back to this theme of a lack of individual responsibility. The American people are crying out to us saying, stop it, we are not that greedy, it is costing us too much money. We literally cannot afford it.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Can I make a point?

Mr. EHRLICH. Absolutely.

Mr. RADANOVICH. It does harken back to personal responsibility and what a privilege it is to live in a country such as America that was based on the principles of self government, and I think that somewhere in some good book it says, do not be so anxious to be suing your neighbor, and I think that the law system in this land, the court system in this land, really is a privilege, and I think that when you abuse a privilege, you end up getting restrictions on the privilege or the privilege gets taken away.

And I admire the fact that the Democrats for so many years defended the right to sue and the open legal system that we have had in the past, but I think what we are seeing right now is such an abuse of the system, and when you, through lack of personal responsibility and personal accountability for your own actions, you begin to abuse the system, you have to clamp down restrictions on that system and, to me, it is a perfect example, again, of where we have lost the idea of personal responsibility and personal accountability in this country.

Stop suing each other. We have sued each other too much. Now because of that and because we have placed such a burden on the system, we have got to clamp down on it. I think that is basically it.

Mr. EHRLICH. Just an aside, but very relevant to your point, as you know, I have practiced law for the last 12 years in the State of Maryland and I have seen one practice occur time and time again. And that practice is, in a run-of-the-mill tort case, personal injury case, a punitive damage count is included, even where there is no evidence of punitive damages.

Now, the opposition told America last week, there are not that many punitive damage judgments. The Republicans have a strident and ridiculous

remedy for a problem that is not that large. We can count on the fingers of one hand how many punitive damage judgments were paid out in a particular jurisdiction. But that is missing the point. That is missing the point, because the fact that those punitive damage counts are included in complaints drives up the settlement value of cases.

Most cases, as the gentleman is well aware of, never go to trial, but the insurance company, the carrier, has to value a case, even a garbage case, at a higher figure because of the presence of a punitive damage count. Result, higher settlement. Result, cost passed on to consumer. Result, higher prices. Result, we got a big problem in this country.

Mr. RADANOVICH. You know, gentleman from Maryland, it seems to me that there are in a book somewhere, and I do not think it said Uncle Sam is my shepherd, it said somebody else, and I think that in America we have just begun to depend too much on Uncle Sam for being a little bit more than what he is and I think that some of the Representatives in the House of Representatives over the years, probably over the last 30 to 40 years, have gotten to the point where they justified their existence by expanding the role of what Federal Government does, and unfortunately, what it has led to is a lot of tragedy, I think, and into a current situation that, again, I am embarrassed to have to defend. I really am.

We have gotten to the point in this country where it is sad, frankly, the way we treat one another in this country and based upon this overriding dependence on Federal Government, and, again, my word to the opposite party, to the Democratic leadership, is, you should be very embarrassed to defend the way things are in Washington right now. And I just got out of a budget hearing today, a markup on bills where we are cutting budgets right now, and I am here to say that nobody is being treated any better than anybody else. The rich are going to get it, the middle class is going to get it, and the poor is going to get it. That is kind of the way it is right now. And the use of the Republicans wanting to do this to reward the rich is a pathetic argument, it really is.

Mr. EHRLICH. We here hear it time and time and time again.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Reinforced by the President as well. Through all that garbage must get some common sense to what we are really trying to accomplish here, and that is, reducing Federal Government by localizing it and privatizing it, and that extends to all areas of Federal Government.

Mr. EHRLICH. And in the process, I, we are looking to your leadership to let the American people know the real facts. I hope the leadership from the Democratic party in this House will

begin to engage in an honest debate. If they have nothing to hide, if they want to defend the welfare state, let's face it, reasonable people can disagree about rescission bills, about welfare reform, about regulatory reform, about tort reform. Just do not hide in the failed policies of the past. Be proactive, look to the future, join us in serving the American people, but to the extent they continue to engage in phony numbers and misrepresentations to the American people on the important issues of the day, we need to call them on it, because to the extent we indulge them, we share the blame and rightfully so.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And it is a disservice to the American people flat out. I mean, what they are doing is clouding what the issues really are on the floor of this House. I have got an issue from one of the Senators in my State regarding a balanced budget amendment, which, in my view, is necessary in order to get spending under control and to achieve privatization and localization, where at one point during that Senator's election, voted for the balanced budget amendment, no limitations whatsoever. In the political race of that person's life, voted for the balanced budget amendment and won the election and then afterward it comes up to the Senate that person voted against the same balanced budget amendment measure. And what I would caution I think on both sides of the party is that people are going to come back to Washington, they better come here with some convictions and they better keep them once they get here because the voters are going to see right through them.

Mr. EHRLICH. We talked about that 2 weeks ago. Cliches, rhetoric, they do not get it. Class warfare. Right here is where the rubber meets the road and the American people can open their newspaper, tune in C-SPAN, listen to the radio, receive our correspondence, and find out who stuck by their guns, who cast tough votes.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And I would say to the Democratic party, rather than hurling stones and misrepresenting what is going on back here, come up with a plan, for God's sake. Bring it up here and let's debate the merits of it. But to use the same old tactic, admitting that maybe they worked for the Republicans in achieving the majority, which I think they are wrong, it was the Contract With America that got us the majority, do what we do, but do the things we did right. Do a plan and sell it to the American people. If they are not going to buy it, then I would suggest you change your plan.

Mr. EHRLICH. You hear time and time again the Democrat spin artists, the Democrat pollsters say, Hey, no one heard about the Contract With America, it is phony, folks, it was just one of those things. It was a bad year.

We had an unpopular President, whatever. But the fact is, people may not have identified the Contract With America, but they knew about regulatory reform and they knew about tax reform and they knew about a stronger national defense.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Balanced budget. Mr. EHRLICH. A balanced budget amendment, a line-item veto. They knew about these things. Maybe they did not label it as the Contract With America, but they recognized it when they saw it and they supported it and they voted accordingly and they are very happy with it.

Mr. RADANOVICH. And frankly I think that is why we are here, but I think the point, too, as to why we are here tonight is to get a point across, that point, and that is the fact that we are here for localizing government to the local level and also privatizing certain functions that Washington does, and that can't be said too many times. It just needs to be said over and over again.

Mr. EHRLICH. Well, I thank the gentleman from California. I look forward to continuing this colloquy in a few weeks with the gentleman with respect to budgetary issues.

Mr. RADANOVICH. Maybe next time we will have a 1-800 number and the people can do call-ins on. I do not know.

Mr. EHRLICH. I look forward to that. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to Mr. COOLEY.

#### TIMBER SALVAGE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about timber salvage. For those watching or listening, I would first like to define this term briefly and then outline the course of my remarks.

Timber salvage is not a difficult concept. Presently, millions of acres of our public forest lands contain trees that have been burned, ravaged by disease or insects, or blown down.

These trees, like any other crop, such as wheat or apples, lose their value if not harvested in a timely fashion. After an apple has dropped from the tree it can still be used for eating if it is picked up quickly; if it is picked up after a few days, it may only be good for cider.

Trees have a little longer timeframe and are a good deal more hardy. Depending on the type of tree, some species may be taken for quality timber a year after falling.

After that, the quality of the wood products derived from these trees decreases. The final stage of downed timber's usefulness comes after the second year as it is sold for chips to be used in making pulp and paper.

Clearly, the commercial life of this crop is limited. If we are to reap some benefit from this resource that would otherwise be wasted, then we must act quickly. This harvesting of trees is known as salvage.

In short, timber salvage is the harvesting of trees that are dead or will die shortly. These trees have value and must be harvested quickly to assure that their economic value is not lost.

Tonight, I want to talk about timber salvage and what it accomplishes for us. I have some pictures that illustrate the effects of our timber policies and the need to continue our careful management of these resources that does not preclude harvesting timber.

□ 2300

I also want to explain the provisions of the bill that will be considered this week to implement a timber salvage program. I will be joined by several of my other colleagues, if time permits. I would like to show them something here.

Here is a photograph, I hope you can pick this up, of a lava butte on October 30, 1992, before man ever came, before the harvesting was ever accomplished on this property. You can see the effects of diseased and dying timber and the effects of fire.

I want to show you the same area on December 8, 1993. This is exactly the same timberland. You can see the greenness and the ability of protecting this forestland. The only intrusion in this entire line was the intrusion of a highway in this area.

This is good management of our natural resources. This is bad management of our natural resources.

We talk about what man has done to our natural resources, Mr. Speaker, and you can see the difference. Before man ever got involved, this is the picture we had in this particular area. In 1993, this is the results of man's intervention and what we have done to improve our forests.

The language that will authorize the salvage of timber is found in section 307 of title III in H.R. 1159.

Briefly, this will allow expedited preparation, advertising, offering, and awarding of contracts without being held up in court while the wood rots on the ground.

In the first year, 3 billion board feet are authorized to be harvested from Federal lands; an additional 3 billion board feet are to be harvested in the following year.

On Bureau of Land Management lands, an additional 115 million board feet are to be harvested each year.

The Secretary may not designate timber stands for sale that belong to the national wilderness preservation system or roadless areas in Colorado and Montana.

Section 318 provisions are written into the bill to award and release previously offered and unawarded timber sale contracts.

Environmental assessments must be prepared by the Secretary pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act and the Endangered Species Act. If the

sale falls on these counts then it will not be allowed.

Each section of land that is harvested must be replanted; the Secretary is given the authority and responsibility to carry this out.

Finally, no restraining order, injunction, or granting of relief may be given to prevent these sales. All civil actions to prevent sales must be completed within 45 days.

This is an extremely important provision that will prevent sales from being held up in court while the need for the sale becomes mute.

#### EFFECTS OF TIMBER SALVAGE ON THE ECONOMY AND ENVIRONMENT

The effects of this bill are three-fold: First, this bill means better forest health. As I mentioned earlier when I showed the picture, active management means more and better forests.

If we allow diseased trees to stand, we are setting the stage for more catastrophic fires and the spread of diseases and infestations. In 1994, 33 young men and women, some of them from my district, lost their lives battling forest fires that consumed 4 million acres of forest land.

The American taxpayer picked up the tab—roughly \$1 billion. Had we not pursued a fire-suppression policy and paid this price, millions more acres may have been lost.

The 4 million acres that burned destroyed 3.6 billion board feet of timber. The value of the burned timber is nearly \$800 million, which amounts to the board footage needed to build 330,000 single-family homes.

It is no secret that wood burns—dry and dead wood burns even better. Lighting strikes or stray sparks from campfires that might have gone out in healthy forests become raging forest fires that consume the unhealthy trees and dead wood with the healthy growth.

Many fires are naturally occurring and even have some beneficial effects. However, the fires that become too intense, scorch the Earth and destroy the helpful nutrients, organisms, and seeds that are needed to regenerate the Earth.

U.S. forests contain an estimated 20 billion board feet of dead or dying timber. This is a huge amount of tinder.

Further, assuming the forests do not experience the ravages of fire, the biological balance is not served by having billions of board feet rot into oblivion on the ground. New growth is stifled.

Second, this bill means revenue for Uncle Sam. In a time of massive cutbacks, such as the rescissions bill we will be considering tomorrow, it is important to generate more revenue through increased commerce.

It is estimated that the salvage acreage in the bill will generate approximately \$1.2 billion in gross revenues over the next 2 years. The release of old sales pursuant to section 318 will bring in over \$115 million.

Mr. Speaker, to date, the efforts of our Federal agencies concerning timber salvage and forest health have been inadequate.

I believe this bill rectifies these errors in judgment and prevents deliberate attempts to lock up timber from any responsible management.

All this is not to mention the money saved from a reduced need to suppress fires. This could be as much as \$200 million.

Third and finally, we will keep timber workers from the unemployment lines. The tension in these communities is high. Fewer harvests mean no jobs and the destruction of the economic base in many small logging towns. As the logger goes, so goes the town.

Other small businesses in these towns depend on the timber worker to spend his paycheck. Rather than describing this as a ripple effect, you could call it a tidal wave. As timber becomes scarce, communities begin to fold.

I'll wager that most of those who oppose even the most responsible logging haven't compiled statistics on the human damage that their antics create. Broken homes, drinking problems, and abuse abound when the pressures to find work increase.

Can the damage we have done by destabilizing these timber communities be fully calculated? Doubtful.

For some mills it is too little, too late. Last week, one mill in my district, the Modoc Co., announced that it would be closing its doors. To date, thousands of workers have been thrown out of work.

This bill will at least stop the carnage. For those who remain there will be timber to harvest and process.

I have received an estimate of the economic benefits that will accrue to these communities and would like to share some of the more important numbers: Employment will increase by 22,900; wages earned by workers will total \$976.1 million; Federal income tax revenues will equal \$150 million; finally, increased payments to the States will bring in \$82.5 million.

As I conclude, remember that timber salvage will help the environment, raise \$1 billion in revenue, and provide jobs for thousands of hard-working, honest people.

When we were receiving testimony on timber salvage last month I heard a story that underscores the idiocy of the policy we are pursuing presently.

A mammoth Douglas-fir had fallen somewhere in the West—a tree whose timber would have brought \$60,000. Instead, while the bureaucrats fiddled, the tree lost its fine timber value, finally being sold for firewood at a cost to the buyer of \$5 a cord.

I believe we can manage our resources better. We must, or the next generation will answer for our negligence. Tomorrow, let us take that

step and approve the salvaging of dead and dying timber.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. TAYLOR].

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statements of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. COOLEY] about the forest salvage bill. It will come up as an amendment on Thursday to the emergency supplemental and rescission package that will be before the House, and the comments the gentleman just made from Oregon are very timely, and I think the whole Nation is beginning to realize that we have in many respects mismanaged our resources over the years.

The question has come up about the Forest Service management of property many times on this floor, and I am not here to defend the Forest Service categorically. I am one who believes that the Government generally will mess up a one-car funeral, and consequently most Government agencies are certainly not perfect. But the Forest Service has a history in the main of taking a nation at the beginning of this century where we had ravaged many of our forests and turned those forests into productive forests to the point that we are growing far more timber today than we are cutting. In fact, Mr. Speaker, more die in the forest than we harvest, and that is a shame when you consider that just in the last 3 years the price of lumber for a home has gone up from \$4,000 to \$6,000 for an average couple, and it is growing, and we have to substitute metal studs, for instance, and other metal components and plastic components for wood components in the home, and that is going to cost the average family more. In addition it is going to be against the environment because when we take metal, which must be mined, first of all creating environmental problems, than it has to be smelted, using a great deal of energy, and then manufactured in a more toxic process, many times greater than wood. In the end of its life disposing of it is much more difficult than wood.

□ 2310

And the same thing with plastic. We have to import the oil from outside the country. Often it is spilled on the way here. We have to fight many times to be able to retain our source of oil. And then the manufacturing process for the plastic is often more toxic and its disposal is more difficult.

So I am saying to you if you take the environmental path, a renewable resource like wood for making the table, or the dais or the chairs that we have, or many other good products, it is much better for us to use that renewable resource of wood than it is to use finite resources such as metal or plastic.

And yet as our country grows and as more homes are needed, we have no al-

ternative but to use some source of materials. The renewable resource of wood is the environmental resource to use. Saying that, we have two sources providing it: First of all from the private sector, from individual farms and individual tracts that are purchased, and a great deal of our forest products come from that. But we also created the National Forest Service at the end of the last century and the beginning of this century to provide fiber for our Nation.

Now, the Forest Service is under the Department of Agriculture because it is to be harvested and grown in our national forests. We have a National Park Service under the Interior Department that is not harvested. There is very little management that goes on inside national parks. We have also set aside over 34 million acres inside the U.S. Forest Service in wilderness designation that is not harvested and is managed much like the national parks. There are other specific set-asides such as wilderness designation, wild and scenic rivers, where no harvest is allowed.

We are down to probably one in five acres of the one-third of this Nation that is publicly owned that even gets any consideration for harvest. The other 80 percent of our publicly owned land is not harvested. And that certainly, I think, disputes the fact that any sort of harvest will ravage our publicly owned lands because we only give attention to approximately one out of five acres.

We need the forest and the harvest also for the economy. We talked a moment ago about the costs going up for the average person buying a home because of the limited sales that are in this Nation now from our Forest Service and from many private lands because of the maze of regulations that have been ensnared around them.

We know that home building, of course, is a very important part of our economy. But as we force homes higher, we are going to decrease the numbers of homes people are able to buy and we are going to hurt the economy and jobs in that way.

I often hear comments made on the floor about the forest sales go to big timber companies. That just is not true. Over 90 percent of the forest sales that are made in this country go to small family-owned organizations, all the way from the operation that may be harvesting the timber to the operation that is manufacturing it.

The major timber companies in this country, by the great portion, harvest a great portion of the timber from their own lands. So most sales that are made are small sales and they are made to small businessmen, in most cases family-owned businesses. It is just not true that there is any big amount.

They also are sold at a public bid. That means that the Forest Service advertises the timber that is for sale and

the highest bid then is accepted and the Forest Service has the right to decline a bid if it is too low. So the government gets the top price in the bid process for its timber in most cases.

Now, what are we talking about tonight in this amendment? We are talking about not green timber that needs also to be harvested. We are talking about dead and dying trees. We are talking about timber that has been burned. We are talking about almost 30 billion board feet of timber in this country that will rot and die and be wasted unless some of it is harvested. We are harvesting only a fraction of it now because of the maze of regulations.

It is important for jobs, as we pointed out, because it can put in the stream in badly harmed areas in the south, southeast, in the Pacific Northwest and other areas, timber that is needed to start the mills going and to provide lumber for homes and for personal use.

But it is not just jobs that are involved. Forest health is involved. And it is a question all over this country. In the south and the southeast, pine beetles have ravaged thousands of acres of timber and used those trees as host trees to spread to other healthy parts of the forest and to spread to private lands.

We had one member of our Committee on Appropriations from Texas that pled that we try to start harvesting in his particular area because the host insects from the Forest Service were going on to private farms all around and destroying timber there.

The gypsy moth has done a great deal of damage. In the Appalachian region, oak decline. Natural disasters, winds, storms, hurricane, and tornadoes, things of that nature have ravaged, broken down timber in the forest. And if it cannot be harvested, it is almost impossible to go in and replant those areas that are destroyed because of the twisted and broken timbers.

In the areas out west where you have had devastating fires, you bake the soil, you create a charcoal mass that goes into the streams. It is almost impossible for vegetation to come back. Certainly not selected vegetation or a species that would be harvestable, a species that would be the best species for that forest.

And so, all across the Nation, we need for forest health to address the question of harvesting salvaged timber. And this amendment that we are offering on Thursday, that will be in the bill and will be voted on on Thursday, would allow the Forest Service to go in and harvest, over a 2-year period, approximately 6.2 billion board feet of timber.

The timber would amount to, probably by that time, about 20 percent of the down and dead timber. We are increasing salvaged timber about 6 billion board feet a year due to natural

disaster, so we will not be getting all of the salvaged timber. It will allow the Forest Service to make the decision of which areas are to be harvested. They can pick those that are least sensitive; those that can be harvested the quickest and with the highest return to the government.

The Forest Service professionals make this decision, not people who are buying the timber, not the mills, not the timber loggers or the harvesters. It will be made by the forest professionals. They will determine which timber will be put on sale.

We know that this will be a plus for the taxpayer, because the CBO has scored a positive return to the taxpayer. The estimates range anywhere from \$36 million the first year all the way up to \$650 million. And it would be difficult to tell exactly the positive return until the sites are selected. But we know that there will be very little effort, little expenditure, put out for these because during the 2 years of this emergency provision there will not be time for road construction or a great deal of activity to go on in preparation.

□ 2310

They will have to go to the commercial areas of the forest. And that is all this applies to, not wilderness areas, park areas, or areas where we cannot cut now, it is to the commercial areas of forest already subject to being harvested. They will have to go to those areas ready and reachable in order to harvest 6.2 billion board feet over the next two years.

So we are saying to you that far too often in the past we have allowed people to use hysteria under the guise of environmentalism, to actually harm the environment, to cost thousands of jobs in the Nation, to drive up the cost of people's individual homes, and to hurt the environment, under the guise of environmentalism. Some of it is from individuals who are well-meaning, who just do not have the expertise or the knowledge. Some of it is deliberate hysteria, because many of those organizations take in hundreds of millions of dollars here in Washington, and by scaring people into sending money to protect something not endangered they can continue to take in those funds. That, unfortunately, is a shame.

With this bill we are using cooperation with professionals, with the Forest Service, with the best knowledge we have in managed silviculture, to go after a resource that is wasting and provide jobs, taxes, and forest health for this Nation. I hope the people of this Nation will all support us and the Members of this body when we vote on that measure Thursday.

I appreciate the gentleman from Maryland giving me the time.

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Idaho [Mrs. CHENOWETH].

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I like to read old books. I was poking around the other day in an old bookstore and found a book on Executive orders, and some of the Executive orders that were issued by President Teddy Roosevelt.

Because force management is an important issue to me, I found this very interesting Executive order that was issued in 1905. It talks about the formation of the Forest Service, and it states in this order that during the year of 1908, severe droughts visited many parts of the country and forest fires were frequent and destructive. But during this time, the National Forest suffered little loss, owing to a system of patrol by which many smaller fires are extinguished before gaining destructive headway. In pursuance of the policy that the forests are for the use of the people under proper restrictions, grazing privileges, timber cutting, haying, and other small privileges are let under government supervision.

I think Mr. Roosevelt's Executive order pretty well lays out what the responsibilities of the Forest Service were and the Forest Service's relationship to the States.

Mr. Speaker, I want to say that we in the West are very proud of our forest reserves, and it is my concern that we be able to bring back to this Nation the proud heritage that our fathers and forefathers left in beautiful stands of timber. We have learned our lessons from unfortunate timber harvest practices.

In the early seventies, a number of environmental pieces of legislation passed this body and were signed into law. Some of the legislation has been characterized as dooming the productive sector. I do not think so. In fact, I wish to rise this evening to defend the National Environmental Policy Act, one of the pieces of legislation which began the movement of more environmental legislation.

The issue is not the environmental legislation that was passed. The issue is today how we are carrying out that environmental legislation. I want to read to you the purpose statement set forth by the Congress of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, known as NEPA.

That purpose and policy statement reads as follows: To declare a national policy which will encourage production and enjoyable harmony between man and his environment; to promote efforts which will prevent or eliminate damage to the environment and biosphere and stimulate the health and welfare of man; to enrich the understanding of the ecological systems and natural resources important to this Nation.

You see, Mr. Speaker, NEPA is a very important document that has been for too long overlooked. First, NEPA is the national policy which recognizes

the importance of production from our natural resources. In fact, the first purpose listed uses the words "encourage production." Second, NEPA recognizes man as an important element of our environment when it states "Harmony between man and his environment." Not only does NEPA recognize man as extremely important in this equation, but recognizes that the environment is his. NEPA indicates that man has the right of possession of the natural resources, but that these resources are to be used in a responsible manner, not to be locked away without man's use. Then NEPA recognizes that man has a role to prevent damage to the environment, so as to stimulate the health and welfare of man.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, NEPA tells us that we must enrich that understanding and importance of natural resources to our Nation. While NEPA clearly defines the role of man with his environment, we as a law making body have failed—failed to provide proper management of our natural forests. The Federal agencies have diverted congressional funds to other programs such as affirmative action programs and ecosystem management programs, multiple agreements with other agencies which are diverted into programs such as ecosystem management. And while this has happened, we have allowed a huge buildup of fuel to build up on the forest floor, creating tremendous potential for fires. That is the reason for this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, last year in the Northwest alone we had 67,000 fires. We burned 8.135 billion board feet of timber. That is enough to construct 542,000 homes and provide 1.5 million jobs just in home construction.

After 9 years of continuous drought in the West, and without proper thinning and harvest, and contrary to the acts of Congress that established the national forests in the beginning, the health and stability of these Federal lands have deteriorated rapidly. Wild fires have devastated millions of acres.

Mr. Speaker, unless these dead stands of timber, the dead and dying timber, is removed immediately through proper harvesting and we return to a proper role of management in our national forests, there will be a tremendous amount of eroded soil to flush into our mountain streams that destroy critical spotting and rearing habitat for our endangered species, the listed salmon.

Although Federal authorities have authority under present law to remove dead and dying timber from our national forests, they have failed to do so, and this is why at this time Congress must intervene to correct this mismanagement.

Timber salvage and proper forest health not only makes good sense for the environment, it makes good sense

for our rural communities, our schools, and our roads and the national Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to close my comments by stating just a few things that wood provides, including rayon, photographic film, alcohol, football helmets, piano keys, on and on and on. This Nation cannot do without wood.

Mr. Speaker, I just hope that this body will recognize that and we can return to a multiple use, sustained yield policy in our national forests.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Miss COLLINS of Michigan (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week, on account of illness.

Mrs. THURMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of a death in the family.

Mr. BLILEY (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), after 2 p.m. today, on account of illness.

Mrs. CUBIN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today and the balance of the week, on account of recovering from surgery.

Mr. ROGERS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY), for today until 5:30 p.m., on account of illness in the family.

#### 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. HANSEN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MANZULLO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CHABOT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GUTKNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAYWORTH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LINDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WAMP, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WHITFIELD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GUTIERREZ, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. KAPTUR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KILDEE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MANZULLO) to revise and

extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. BUYER.

Mr. HASTERT.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. BAKER of California.

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

Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mrs. SCHROEDER.

Mr. MONTGOMERY.

Mr. MATSUI.

Ms. WOOLSEY.

Mr. NEAL.

Ms. SLAUGHTER.

Mr. MINETA.

Mr. SCHUMER.

Mr. FILNER.

Ms. ESHOO.

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

Mr. PACKARD.

Mr. LAHOOD.

Mr. FORBES, in two instances.

Mr. LATOURETTE.

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

Mr. ROTH.

Mr. PALLONE.

Mr. GORDON.

Ms. BROWN of Florida.

Mr. OWENS.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois.

#### ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Wednesday, March 15, 1995, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

534. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act which occurred in the Department of the Air Force, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1517(b); to the Committee on Appropriations.

535. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State,

transmitting the Secretary's determination and certification regarding Government actions to terminate chemical weapons proliferation activities of foreign persons, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. app. 2410c(b)(2); to the Committee on International Relations.

536. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning a cooperative research and development effort with the NATO Hawk Production and Logistics Organization for the fire direction operations center project (Transmittal No. 03-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2676(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

537. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification concerning the engineering and manufacturing development [EMD] phase of the Evolved Seasparrow Missile Program (Transmittal No. 04-95), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

538. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-27, "Air Pollution Control Program Regulations Federal Conformity Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

539. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-28, "Government Managers Accountability Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

540. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-26, "Foreign Physicians of Conceded Eminence University, Hospital, and Medical Centers Practices Amendment Act of 1995," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

541. A letter from the Director, Audit Operations, Division B, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final report, "Review of VA's Implementation of the Anti-Influencing Requirements of Public Law 101-121," pursuant to Public Law 101-121, section 319(a)(1) (103 Stat. 753); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

542. A letter from the Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(b); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

543. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report of activities under the Freedom of Information Act for calendar year 1994, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552(d); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

544. A letter from the Boy Scouts of America, transmitting the Boy Scouts of America 1994 report to the Nation, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 28; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

545. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting three reports on sentencing issues; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

546. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of the space situation report for Cambria County, PA, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

**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. ROBERTS: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 1135. A bill to improve the commodity distribution programs of the Department of Agriculture, to reform and simplify the Food Stamp Program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 104-77). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 115. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1158) making emergency supplemental appropriations for additional disaster assistance and making rescissions for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1995, and for other purposes (Rept. 104-78). Referred to the House Calendar.

**PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, and Mr. REGULA):  
H.R. 1221. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to establish Federal standards for long-term care insurance policies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin (for himself, Mr. KLUG, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MINGE, Mr. DICK- EY, Mr. MCHALE, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, and Mr. CASTLE):  
H.R. 1222. A bill to require that travel awards that accrue by reason of official travel of a Member, officer, or employee of the House of Representatives be used only with respect to official travel; to the Committee on House Oversight.

By Mr. BROWN of California:  
H.R. 1223. A bill to amend the act of June 15, 1938, to extend the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to purchase lands within the boundaries of certain National Forests in the State of California to include the Angeles National Forest and to expand the purpose for which such purchases may be made; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia:  
H.R. 1224. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to detail members of the Armed Forces to other Federal agencies to assist such agencies in enforcing the drug, immigration, and customs laws of the United States in border areas, to make certain aliens ineligible for certain social services, and to provide for grants to the States to compensate for State costs associated with resident lawful aliens; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on National Security, Agriculture, Commerce, Ways and Means, and Economic and Educational Opportunities, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. CHRISTENSEN):  
H.R. 1225. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to exempt employees

who perform certain court reporting duties from the compensatory time requirements applicable to certain public agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 1226. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to make uniform the application of the overtime exemption for inside sales personnel; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. FAWELL:  
H.R. 1227. A bill to amend the Portal-to-Portal Act of 1947 relating to the payment of wages to employees who use employer-owned vehicles; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. HUNTER (for himself and Mr. CUNNINGHAM):

H.R. 1228. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide a limited exemption from the child labor provisions of such act; to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island:  
H.R. 1229. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for the payment of interest on student loans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MICA (for himself, Mr. OBER- STAR, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. LI- PINSKI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BLUTE, Mrs. SEASTRAND, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HOYER, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. HYDE, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG):

H.R. 1230. A bill to authorize the Architect of the Capitol to establish a Capitol Visitor Center under the East Plaza of the U.S. Capitol, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OLVER:  
H.R. 1231. A bill to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to improve the provision of trade readjustment allowances during breaks in training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKEEN (for himself, Mr. HAN- SEN, and Mrs. CHENOWETH):

H.R. 1232. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey, upon request, certain property in Federal reclamation projects to beneficiaries of the projects and to set forth a distribution scheme for revenues from reclamation project lands; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WISE:

H.R. 1233. A bill to improve budgetary information by requiring that the unified budget presented by the President contain an operating budget and a capital budget, distinguish between general funds, trust funds, and enterprise funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Rules, and Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMAS (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. ENSIGN, Mr. CRANE, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOB-

SON, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HORN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. LAZIO of New York, Mr. BLUTE, Mr. LONGLEY, Mr. EHLERS, Ms. PRYCE, Mr. BASS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. KOLBE, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. GUTKNECHT, and Mr. PACKARD):

H.R. 1234. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for reform of the health insurance market, to promote the availability and continuity of health coverage, to remove financial barriers to access, to enhance health care quality, to contain costs through market incentives and administrative reforms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, Economic and Educational Opportunities, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ZIMMER (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. FAWELL):

H.R. 1235. A bill to terminate the price support program for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. EMERSON (for himself, Mr. MINETA, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. DREIER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. CALVERT):

H. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Federal disaster relief; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

**PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Ms. LOWEY:  
H.R. 1236. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Dante*; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. OBERSTAR:  
H.R. 1237. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Doppler Effect*; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. REED:  
H.R. 1238. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for each of 3 barges; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ROHRBACHER:  
H.R. 1239. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel *Dordy III*; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

**ADDITIONAL SPONSORS**

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

H.R. 3: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 6: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.  
 H.R. 26: Mr. RADANOVICH and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.  
 H.R. 46: Mr. BRYANT of Tennessee, Mr. LINDER, Mr. PARKER, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HOEKSTRA, and Mr. HAYWORTH.  
 H.R. 70: Mr. UNDERWOOD.  
 H.R. 71: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 75: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. GEKAS, and Mr. TORKILDSEN.  
 H.R. 325: Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 328: Mr. LIPINSKI.  
 H.R. 354: Mr. ZIMMER.  
 H.R. 359: Mr. COMBEST and Ms. HARMAN.  
 H.R. 459: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. CALVERT, Mrs. WALDHOLTZ, Mr. WICKER, and Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina.  
 H.R. 460: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. NEY, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. KING, Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. ZIMMER.  
 H.R. 580: Mr. COLEMAN, Mr. FARR, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mr. GEJDENSON.  
 H.R. 587: Mr. SAXTON and Mr. ZIMMER.  
 H.R. 592: Mr. EMERSON and Mr. WELDON of Florida.  
 H.R. 612: Mr. HOEKSTRA.  
 H.R. 656: Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. JONES, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. ROYCE.  
 H.R. 682: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland and Mr. BEREUTER.  
 H.R. 732: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. GREENWOOD, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 783: Mr. UPTON, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CALAHAN, Mr. SPENCE, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. CRAMER.  
 H.R. 789: Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. CREMEANS, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.  
 H.R. 849: Mr. STUDDS, Mr. HOKE, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. MORAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. DEUTSCH.  
 H.R. 877: Mr. VENTO.  
 H.R. 911: Mr. CLINGER and Mr. SPRATT.  
 H.R. 913: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HANCOCK, and Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland.  
 H.R. 930: Mr. SKEEN.  
 H.R. 939: Mr. BILBRAY.  
 H.R. 989: Mr. GORDON.  
 H.R. 1005: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. ROYCE.  
 H.R. 1018: Mr. HEINEMAN.  
 H.R. 1020: Mr. HYDE.  
 H.R. 1021: Mr. CARDIN.  
 H.R. 1023: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida.  
 H.R. 1024: Mr. ROYCE.  
 H.R. 1044: Mr. HYDE and Mr. ROYCE.  
 H.R. 1085: Mr. CAMP and Mr. MCHUGH.  
 H.R. 1098: Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. WICKER, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mr. ROYCE.  
 H.R. 1101: Mr. WOLF and Mr. WYNN.  
 H.R. 1103: Mr. HOLDEN.  
 H.R. 1118: Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. STUMP, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. BALLENGER.  
 H.R. 1136: Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. DELLUMS, and Mr. TORRES.  
 H.R. 1143: Mr. HYDE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.

H.R. 1144: Mr. HYDE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H. Con. Res. 5: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. BUNN of Oregon, Mr. BAKER of Louisiana, and Mr. SOUDER.  
 H. Con. Res. 12: Mr. OXLEY.  
 H. Res. 18: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. TORKILDSEN, and Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 94: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KLING, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1159

OFFERED BY: MR. NEUMANN

AMENDMENT NO. 15: At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

MORATORIUM ON REFORMULATED GASOLINE REQUIREMENTS IN STATE OF WISCONSIN  
 SEC. 308. None of the funds made available in any appropriation Act for fiscal year 1995 may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to administer or enforce (1) any requirement of the sale, dispensing, or use of reformulated gasoline for motor vehicles in the State of Wisconsin; or (2) any prohibition on the sale, dispensing, or use of conventional gasoline for motor vehicles in the State of Wisconsin.