

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, October 9, 1991

The House met at 12 noon.

The Reverend Dr. Ronald F. Christian, assistant to the bishop, Evangelical Lutheran Church in America, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, according to Your wisdom and created order, the seasons of the year come and go.

At this time, we give You thanks for the return of planting, the harvesting of crops, and the blessings You pour out upon this Nation and people.

Give us all a full understanding of Your mercy and compassion.

Help us to live in such a way that our lives will show respect for Your good will. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

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

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

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PAXON led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Hallen, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title.

H.J. Res. 230. Joint resolution designating October 16, 1991, and October 16, 1992, each as "World Food Day."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2508) "An act to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to rewrite the authorities of that act in order to establish more effective assistance programs and eliminate obsolete and inconsistent provisions, to amend the Arms Export Control Act and to redesignate that act as the Defense Trade and Export Control Act, to authorize appropriations for foreign assistance pro-

grams for fiscal years 1992 and 1993, and for other purposes."

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

S. 1823. An act to amend the Veterans' Benefit and Services Act of 1988 to authorize the Department of Veterans Affairs to use for the operation and maintenance of the National Memorial Cemetery of Arizona funds appropriated during fiscal year 1992 for the National Cemetery System;

S.J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to designate October 15, 1991, as "National Law Enforcement Memorial Dedication Day"; and

S.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution designating the week beginning October 20, 1991, as "World Population Awareness Week."

## ELECTION OF MEMBERS TO STANDING COMMITTEES

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic caucus, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 243), and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

### H. RES. 243

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be, and they are hereby, elected to the following standing committees of the House of Representatives:

Committee on Education and Labor: Ed Pastor of Arizona.

Committee on Small Business: Ed Pastor of Arizona.

Committee on Appropriations: Peter J. Visclosky of Indiana.

Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs: Neil Abercrombie of Hawaii; Cal Dooley of California.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so in order to assure the House that the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] during his 1 minute will comply with all applicable rules of the House. Can the gentleman give me that assurance?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. WALKER. And the gentleman is aware of the rules of the House as they apply to 1 minute, and he is confident

that his 1-minute speech will comply with all of those rules; is that correct?

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, absolutely.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, President Bush continues to block extended unemployment benefits and his administration continues to tell us the economy will be fine. He does not get it, does he?

Mr. Speaker, maybe we need to state the problem in very simple terms that the President can understand. People all over this country are losing their jobs. The numbers speak for themselves:

Unisys Corp., Blue Bell, PA, 10,000 jobs lost; Pan Am Corp., New York, 5,000 jobs lost; Union Pacific Corp., Bethlehem, PA, 3,000 to 4,000 jobs lost; DuPont Co., Wilmington, DE, 3,750 jobs lost; Texas Instruments, Dallas TX, 3,200 jobs lost; Eastman Kodak, Rochester, NY, 3,000 jobs lost; Martin Marietta, Bethesda, MD, 2,500 jobs lost; Hewlett-Packard, Palo Alto, CA, 2,000 jobs lost; General Electric Co., Fairfield, CT, 2,000 jobs lost; Colgate-Palmolive Co., NY, 2,000 jobs lost; Frito-Lay, Plano, TX, 1,800 jobs lost; NYNEX, NY, 1,400 jobs lost; Westinghouse, Pittsburgh, PA, 4,000 jobs lost; John Deere & Co., East Moline, IL, 575 jobs lost.

Mr. President, this can go on for a long, long time.

### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from Texas just made reference to the President, addressed the President directly. Is that within the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER. There is no rule of the House against references to the President, as long as they are not derogatory.

Mr. WALKER. The gentleman from Texas made at the end of his speech, he addressed specifically the President rather than addressing the Chair. Is that within the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER. All speeches in the House are addressed to the Chair, not to persons not in the Chamber.

Mr. WALKER. Is the Chair prepared to call to order Members who, as the gentleman from Texas just did, who do not properly follow the rules and proce-

□ 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.

dures of the House, even after giving this gentleman assurance that he understood the rules and would obey them? The gentleman from Texas, in fact, did not follow the rules of the House.

Is the Chair prepared to call Members to order who do not follow the appropriate rules of the House of Representatives?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is certainly prepared to call all Members to order on either side of the aisle if they do not follow the rules and practice of the House. Members will address their remarks to the Chair and to no other person.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, can I assume that the Chair did not hear the Member from Texas and that is the reason why he was not called to order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair's attention was distracted.

#### RETURN TAX FAIRNESS TO THE REAL ESTATE INDUSTRY, REPEAL THE PASSIVE LOSS RULES

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, on our side we will presume that all Members know the rules. We will presume that the gentleman who is about to speak is going to follow the rules, and we will presume that all of the Members who rise to speak will follow the rules.

If in the course of their debate we find that they do not, we will of course raise that issue. We will not assume that any Member intentionally is going to violate the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to restate my support for the repeal of the passive loss tax rules on the real estate industry. I along with 311 of my colleagues are sponsors of Texas Congressman MICHAEL ANDREWS' and California Congressman WILLIAM THOMAS' bill to repeal this unfair tax.

Why should we separate passive income from active income in the real estate industry but not many others?

Why should people in the real estate industry be penalized by paying taxes on gross income, while most other industries pay taxes only on net income?

Repeal of this tax will encourage real estate entrepreneurs to purchase troubled properties from the Resolution Trust Corporation and help all Americans by reducing the size of the savings and loan bailout.

This tax treatment of real estate losses discourages the influx of capital in real estate investment and perpetuates the real estate slump.

We should return the tax treatment of real estate to its historic status. Please support H.R. 1414 and repeal this unjust tax.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bill earlier today:

S. 1722. An act to provide emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes.

#### DOE STIFFS NEW MEXICO

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wish to ascertain from the gentleman whether or not he is prepared to comply with all rules of the House in the course of delivering his 1-minute statement and whether or not he understands all applicable rules of the House so that we can be assured that he will comply with those rules.

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

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, my statement fully complies with the rules of the House.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman. I would simply point out in response to the gentleman from Maryland, who spoke a minute ago, the fact is that yesterday what we saw happen was that despite the Chair disciplining a number of Members or suggesting to a number of Members that they ought to live within the rules of the House, we had a series of speeches where Members did not comply and finally had a ruling by the Chair that a Member was specifically out of order. Yet we then saw the majority, using the majority vote, take it upon themselves to eliminate that discipline for when the Member was ruled out of order.

That is the reason why this gentleman is proceeding in the manner that I am today, to assure that if we cannot live by the rule of law in the House that at least Members give me their specific assurance that they will try to live within the rules.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1210

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, the State of New Mexico and this Congress

were illegally bypassed by the Department of Energy and Admiral Watkins late last week.

Let this be a warning to my colleagues who have a facility, DOE facility, in your State: This can happen to you.

By signing an administrative withdrawal to open a low-level nuclear waste dump in southern New Mexico, the Department of Energy, in effect, told the State of New Mexico, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on the Interior to stuff it. Clearly DOE believes they are above the law by their failure to obtain legislative authority for operating the WIPP site in New Mexico. This facility is not ready to open.

Furthermore, DOE's poor safety record that has characterized its national operations is also evident at WIPP.

Today, the New Mexico attorney general is filing suit in Washington to stop the land transfer. I applaud the attorney general's efforts and will be joining a separate citizens' suit against the Department of Energy.

I am hopeful that these suits will block the premature shipment of radioactive waste to New Mexico and send a clear signal to DOE that its illegal dictator-like directive will not be tolerated in New Mexico by the Congress or in court.

#### WELCOME TO PRESIDENT OF ICELAND AND QUEEN OF NORWAY

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, today our Government is honored by a visit from Her Excellency Vigdis Finnbogadottir, President of Iceland, and Her Majesty Queen Sonja of Norway, to commemorate the 1,000th anniversary of Leif Eriksson's visit to the North American Continent which he called Vinland. Archeological excavations in Newfoundland now confirm the Viking settlements of that period.

To remind us of that courageous voyage and exploration, three replicas of Viking ships are today anchored in the Potomac River, here in Washington, DC. One of those small but sturdy vessels actually retraced the course of the original voyage by Leif Eriksson and his Viking crew from Iceland to Greenland to the North American Continent. Since Eriksson, the son of Erik the Red, was a son of Iceland and a grandson of Norway, the pride of these two friendly countries and allies and of Americans of Norwegian or Icelandic heritage is altogether understandable on this historic day of commemoration.

Last night a reception in honor of Her Excellency and Her Majesty was



held in the National Air and Space Museum to symbolize man's continuing quest to explore the unknown and to focus attention on the environmental message and orientation of the crews of the Viking ships now visiting our shores.

Mr. Speaker, I know my colleagues in the House will join me in a hearty welcome to our Icelandic and Norwegian friends.

#### WORKERS BOUGHT AND PAID FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks, and I wish to assure all Members that I will comply with the rules.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves the right to object.

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, I do so to inquire of the gentleman whether or not he is going to—

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands regular order. Is there objection?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana demands regular order. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I am observing regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will have to state an objection. The reservation has been responded to by a demand for regular order. Will the gentleman object to the gentleman's request?

Mr. WALKER. I do not object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NAGLE].

Mr. NAGLE. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President is wrong in saying the job market today is better than it was in the 1970's.

Although certainly his employment prospects improved over the last 12 years, that cannot be said for millions upon millions of working people.

In a few moments, the Vice President will affix his signature on our unemployment legislation and the bill will be sent to the White House.

At that point, the President will have to confront these fundamental questions.

After creating fewer jobs than Jimmy Carter, after having economic growth less vibrant than Gerald Ford, after permitting millions of Americans to go without jobs, will he sign an unemployment insurance bill—insurance these workers bought and paid for?

If the President is true to his campaign pledges, he will sign the bill, and on behalf of the people who suffer from that unemployment, I hope that he does.

#### THE DEFICIT MONGERS: DAY 28

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

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 28th day until the first anniversary of the signing of the infamous 1990 budget summit agreement. A year ago this month, the majority in this Congress enacted a budget agreement designed to reduce the deficit by \$500 billion over 5 years.

We are now seeing the results of that agreement—a sagging economy, jobs lost, soaring Federal spending, and record budget deficits. According to the latest projections, the deficit this year will be more than \$350 billion. Over the next 5 years the majority of Congress will increase the national debt by \$1 trillion.

The truly remarkable thing about all of this is that only the minority of this Congress seems to care. The pundits and the politicians who ranted and raved about the budget deficit last year have mysteriously disappeared.

Could it be the deficit mongers did not really care about the deficit in the first place? Could it be they were simply using the deficit as a smoke screen to raise taxes? It certainly looks that way.

#### AMERICA'S DOMESTIC PRIORITIES GONE TO THE DOGS

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Without objection, the gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object; I reserve the right to object simply to inquire as to—

Mr. JACOBS. Madam Speaker, I demand regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order is demanded.

Mr. WALKER. And I reserve the right to object under regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman object? Does the gentleman object?

Mr. WALKER. The Chair is informing—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair, and I will not object.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for 1 full minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, the remains of 800 beagles and 1,700 tons of their radioactive urine and feces will be buried at a nuclear site in the State of Washington.

The dead dogs have been in freezers since 1950. They were part of a study to assess the damage of radioactive fallout. The study is now conclusive: radioactive fallout is fatal, and canines subject thereto died.

But the point is, Madam Speaker, the funeral is going to cost \$22 million.

Tell me, are they going to ship the bodies by limo? Are they going to have gold tombstones for every hound?

With 37 million people in America without health insurance, 9 million people unemployed, I would like to say that our Government is spending \$22 million to erect a giant fire hydrant as a mausoleum to dead beagles.

I think that says it all, Madam Speaker. America's domestic priorities have gone to the dogs.

#### TRIBUTE TO GEORGE RUSSELL

Mr. JACOBS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. JACOBS. I demand regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman reserves the right to object.

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object to inquire of the gentleman whether or not he is going to comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. JACOBS. I demand regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded. Is there objection?

Mr. WALKER. I will not object, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JACOBS].

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBS. Madam Speaker, Edwin Markham wrote a poem on the death of Lincoln.

And when he fell, in whirlwind he went down  
As when a lordly cedar, green with boughs,  
Goes down with a great shout upon the hills,  
And leaves a lonesome place against the sky.

As was pointed out by the gentleman from Maryland yesterday, there is something sadly missing from this Chamber forever, and that is the bright smile of our dear friend and fellow worker, George Russell, whose smile those who have watched the proceedings sitting right behind me year in and year out.

He has left our midst, and he has left a lonesome place in this Chamber, and we all hurt because of it.

□ 1220

# TAX EXEMPT ORGANIZATIONS FUNDING FMLN REBELS IN EL SALVADOR

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Madam Speaker, last week a captured cache of weapons belonging to the Salvadoran FMLN rebels was on display in H-227 of the U.S. Capitol. To my knowledge, very few Members took advantage of the opportunity to view the \$12 million weapons cache. It would appear that many Members of Congress would rather not admit that arms are still being shipped to the rebels, who are supposedly negotiating for a peaceful settlement of the long civil war in El Salvador.

Since the Soviet Union is no longer aiding the rebels, and the Nicaraguan Sandinistas are selling their excess arms on the world market, where are the funds coming from to purchase the arms? The funds that used to come from Europe to finance arms purchases have stopped flowing to the FMLN.

Would you believe that most of the funding used to buy these arms is coming tax free from the United States? Organizations affiliated with the non-profit lobbying group CISPEP [Committee in Solidarity with the People of El Salvador], such as New El Salvador Today [NEST], Medical Aid for El Salvador, and the Salvadoran Humanitarian Aid Research and Education [SHARE] Foundation are raising tax exempt funds and sending these funds to the rebels—helping to prolong the war. And of course, everyone knows of Jennifer Casolo's fund raising association with the FMLN.

These organizations that fund continued killing during peace negotiations should stop. At the very least, they should lose their tax exemption.

## SEXUAL HARASSMENT A REALITY IN THE WORKPLACE

Ms. LONG. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

Mr. JACOBS. Madam Speaker, I demand regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order is demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Indiana?

Mr. WALKER. I will not object, Madam Speaker. I would ask whether or not the gentlewoman—

Mr. JACOBS. Madam Speaker, regular order.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman appears to be prepared to read from papers. Does the gentlewoman need unanimous consent to be able to do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. If that is demanded, the request has to be made.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

Has she asked that permission at this point?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has not made any indication that she is going to read.

Mr. WALKER. An objection would be in order if she reads from papers, however, under the rules of the House, is that correct?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman going to continue to object, or withdraw his objection?

Mr. WALKER. I am making a parliamentary inquiry with regard to the rules of the House, Madam Speaker. My inquiry is whether or not the gentlewoman has asked permission of the House to be able to read from papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rules of the House, the gentlewoman has not yet requested to read from papers, and she may now proceed.

Ms. LONG. Madam Speaker, in the past 48 hours there has been a tremendous amount of attention paid to the issue of sexual harassment. It is not a pleasant subject and it is not a subject that most of us are eager to discuss; but it is a reality in the workplace, and more often than not the victims of sexual harassment are women, and I believe that more often than not those who are guilty of such behavior do not even realize the impact of what they are doing.

It was not too long ago that a colleague of mine complimented me on my appearance and then said that he was going to chase me around the House floor. Because he was not my boss, I was not intimidated, but I was offended and I was embarrassed.

Sexual harassment is serious. It is not funny and it is not cute, and it certainly is not complimentary. The victims, like a battered wife, often feel that they have no recourse and no way out.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in fighting sexual harassment by doing everything we can through the legislative process and also through implementation of formal antiharassment policies in our offices.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). The Chair will remind all

people in the galleries that they are guests of the House and also that there should be a reservation of clapping.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. In the opinion of the Chair, Madam Speaker, did the previous speaker not read from papers despite the fact that she had papers before her that she was leafing through?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is the opinion of the Chair.

Mr. WALKER. The opinion of the Chair is that the Member preceding did not read from papers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The opinion of the Chair is that the gentlewoman from Indiana did not read from papers.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chair.

## A TREASURED PICTURE, AND THE CRIME BILL

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

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, a while ago my staff called me and said, "Your picture is in a local publication," and I wondered why. There it was at this very podium with George Russell sitting behind me fully portrayed in that picture. It turned out that it was a story about George Russell who happened to sit here and do all the wonderful things that he did. I just happened to be in the picture. I was glad to have that picture and I will treasure it now all the more after we learned of his untimely death.

Madam Speaker, my sympathies and all our sympathies to his family.

Madam Speaker, pretty soon we are going to be arguing on the crime bill. This crime bill that is going to come before us is very weak. It does not include reform of the exclusionary rule.

Just for example, the American public is sick and tired of seeing the vision of a criminal who goes before a judge and then the judge dismisses the case against him, even though he was caught redhanded in the commission of a burglary or a larceny or some other felony, and dismisses the case because of some technicality.

We need to reform the exclusionary rule to allow individuals who are caught redhanded to be prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law.

## THE TRIALS OF MARTIN GAFFNEY

Mr. ATKINS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the



House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been requested. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object or withdraw the objection?

Mr. WALKER. I do not object, Madam Speaker.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, has the gentleman from Massachusetts requested permission to read from papers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not know from the vantage point of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but from the Chair's vantage point, the Chair cannot see any papers.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chair for that. From my vantage point, I can, and my point is, has the gentleman asked permission to read from papers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Let the Chair clarify this right now. The usual order of the House is that Members can use papers, and that is the usual order of the House.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is right. If the gentleman goes to the rules of the House and he objects that someone reads from papers, then the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has a right to object and the Chair has to put the question to the House if requested by the Member seeking to read.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. My only point, Madam Speaker, is that Members who desire to read from papers can ask unanimous consent that they be permitted to do so and can proceed from that order.

This parliamentary inquiry was simply whether or not the gentleman from Massachusetts has so asked the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The custom is that one does not object, but if someone does object, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] is objecting, it is the ruling of the Chair that papers cannot be used absent permission of the House.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker. The Chair is not responding to my point. The only point I ask the Chair was whether or not the gentleman from Massachusetts has asked permission to read from papers. The Chair can either tell me yes or no.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The custom of the House is to reserve that objection until the question is raised by another Member of the House.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania is now raising a parliamentary question. The Chair answers that if the gentleman raises the objection, the Chair has to say that the Members should not read from a piece of paper, though customarily a Member is allowed to read from a piece of paper.

Mr. WALKER. A further parliamentary inquiry, Madam Speaker. In order to make that objection, can I interrupt the gentleman who is speaking in the House? My understanding would be they would have to yield to me for that. That is the reason I am making the parliamentary inquiry prior to them taking control of the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may call to the attention of the Chair the reading of the paper if the gentleman so requests.

Is the gentleman requesting this ruling right now?

Mr. WALKER. I am requesting, Madam Speaker, whether or not the gentleman has asked unanimous consent to proceed to read from papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not been notified that the gentleman from Massachusetts intends to read from a piece of paper.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chair.

Mr. ATKINS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for permission to read from papers.

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

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

Mr. JACOBS. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been requested. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object, or withdraw his objection?

Mr. WALKER. I object, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS] is recognized for 1 minute.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, could the gentleman from Massachusetts now move that he be permitted to read from papers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair does not see the gentleman from Massachusetts raising the question at this time.

Mr. WALKER. Well, Madam Speaker, it is a legitimate parliamentary inquiry, and the parliamentary inquiry is, "Can the gentleman from Massachu-

setts now move that he be permitted to read from papers?"

□ 1230

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). The Chair will inform the gentleman from Pennsylvania that no other Member may move. But if the gentleman from Massachusetts desires to move, he may.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. ATKINS. Madam Speaker, on Monday the U.S. Justice Department denied the compensation which had been awarded to Martin Gaffney, a Marine Corps officer. Madam Speaker, Martin Gaffney was awarded by U.S. district court \$3.8 million as a result of negligence in a U.S. military hospital. Martin Gaffney lies dying from the AIDS virus. His wife passed away several years ago from the AIDS virus. His one son, who died, a 1-year-old son who died from the AIDS virus.

The Justice Department, in what can only be described as a cruel move, has appealed the decision of the U.S. district court, appealed that decision despite the request of the U.S. attorney in Boston.

Madam Speaker, it is time for the Justice Department to recognize simple decency, to give Martin Gaffney the opportunity to provide a secure future for his daughter and to do the right thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ATKINS] has expired.

#### ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT OF 1991

Ms. SNOWE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to read from a text and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentlewoman's reading?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to again reiterate on this side of the aisle our respect for every one of the Members sitting here to give a 1-minute on the other side of the aisle, most of whom have papers in their hands, and we presume they have prepared those. We also presume that they could say it extemporaneously as well as they could say it reading from the paper.

Madam Speaker, these objections are not in the interest of the comity of the House, and we will not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Maine that she be allowed to address the House for 1 minute, and that she be permitted to read from a text?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE] is recognized for 1 minute.

Ms. SNOWE. I thank the Chair.

Madam Speaker, today the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues is introducing the Economic Equity Act; broad, sweeping legislation that addresses many of the economic needs of women and families.

The Economic Equity Act, composed of 24 bills, is broken down into four categories: employment opportunities, women in business, economic justice, and retirement equity. By emphasizing these important areas, the Economic Equity Act represents a comprehensive legislative response to the changing nature of the work force and family.

One particular changing and troubling trend in American families is the growing number of single-parent households. In 1990, 1 in 4 families with children under 18 were headed by a single parent.

In some of these cases, receiving child support payments means the difference between self-sufficiency and welfare. In fact, in 1990, of those parents awarded child support, one-quarter received less than the full amount and another one-quarter received nothing at all.

In response to this unsatisfactory record of child support collections, the legislation I have drafted as part of the Economic Equity Act would strengthen and improve a variety of child support enforcement mechanisms, including the aggressive enforcement of medical support in order to reduce Medicaid costs and keep more children healthy.

Madam Speaker, this legislation represents the first step in helping to relieve the economic burden on vulnerable families. I urge my colleagues to lend your support for this important legislative package by cosponsoring the Economic Equity Act.

#### DEFICIT REDUCTION CRITICAL TO NATION'S ECONOMIC HEALTH

Mr. LUKEN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to refer to my paper.

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, regular order.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I do so simply to ask the gentleman whether or not he is prepared to comply with the rules of the House in delivering his 1-minute.

Mr. LUKEN. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LUKEN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, I will comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the gentleman, Madam Speaker, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LUKEN. Madam Speaker, over the weekend Budget Director Richard Darman conceded that Defense spending might be reduced below expected levels in the face of sweeping changes on the international scene. It is time for the administration and Congress to carefully review where those savings can be achieved.

It is also time for Congress to state its intention that any savings from reductions in defense spending will go to offset the deficit—not increased spending.

Madam Speaker, the citizens of this country understand that reducing the deficit is primary to the goal of economic health for ourselves and our children. Last week, I introduced House Resolution 233 that will commit Congress to spending discipline—discipline that requires savings from the defense budget to offset the deficit.

Madam Speaker, some want defense savings to go to more domestic spending and some want the savings to fuel a growth package. We'll just have to figure out how to live within existing limits.

Let us do the Nation a favor by committing all savings to deficit reduction.

#### THE GLASS CEILING ACT, PART OF THE ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT

Ms. MOLINARI. Madam Speaker, I ask the unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to read from a text.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. MOLINARI. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the Economic Equity Act, introduced yesterday by the bipartisan Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues. The Economic Equity Act is a comprehensive future-oriented agenda for improving the economic well-being of American women. Introduced since 1981, this package of legislation is designed to promote a quality and diverse work force capable of meeting the challenge of global competition.

Included in the Equal Opportunity Employment title of this legislation is a bill entitled the Glass Ceiling Act. The Glass Ceiling Act would establish a 17-member commission to study further why the glass ceiling, the invisible barrier keeping qualified minorities and women from moving up into management jobs, exists. This commission

will make recommendations and will offer a national award to those businesses that have made strides in promoting women.

Madam Speaker, despite more than two decades of battle for equal opportunity, women still earn less than men in almost every field, even those dominated by women, and we are not making our way to the top of corporate America. This legislation will improve tomorrow's work force.

#### THE PRESIDENT NEEDS TO LISTEN TO THE PEOPLE OF THIS COUNTRY ON THE UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION ISSUE

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and I ask unanimous consent to read from a paper.

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been called for.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, regular order.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, has the gentleman asked permission to revise and extend her remarks, has she asked permission to address the House for 1 minute, and has she asked permission to read from papers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct on all three counts.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I do not object to the gentleman doing her 1-minute or revising and extending. Madam Speaker, I do object to her reading from papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Since the gentleman does object—

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield under his parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WALKER. Sure. I would be glad to yield to the gentleman under my parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman stating a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. HOYER. I would like to ask him to yield under his—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Maryland?

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, sure I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair controls the parliamentary inquiry. At this moment, the gentleman from Connecticut has been recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. WALKER. And, you know, my understanding is I am objecting to her reading from papers. That is the only objection I have.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. And the gentleman, if he is making that objection, is making a correct objection, and the Chair has to agree with the objection.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAULO] for 1 minute.

Ms. DELAULO. I thank the Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the President today has the opportunity to help ease the burden of the working men and women in this country by helping them in their extension of unemployment benefits. Today the Congress will send to the President the unemployment compensation bill, giving him the opportunity to ease that economic burden on the men and women in this country. The people of this House have spoken. The people of the country have spoken through their House Members. In passing the unemployment compensation bill with 300 votes. That is indicative of the feeling of the Members of this House and the people, that we ought to have an unemployment compensation bill that will extend their benefits because they have run out. In my State we have had a recession for the last 2 years. 40,000 men and women have had their unemployment benefits ended. They need help.

The President needs to listen to the people of this country. He needs to help them with this recession, and he needs to sign the bill. The American people are calling for it. And he needs to respond to that call.

#### BOUNCING CHECKS: THE BRUSH THAT PAINTS SOME PAINTS ALL

Mr. ZELIFF. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to read from papers and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ZELIFF. Madam Speaker, I just completed my 51st town meeting last Saturday. I am very concerned about the lack of respect from members of the public who put us in this position of trust.

I have not, personally, bounced any checks, and I paid all my restaurant bills. Unfortunately, the brush that paints some paints all.

I do not like being considered a dead beat.

Clarence Thomas, a very fine person, a very fine man, I cannot believe, as I

watch his reputation, is destroyed by information that is leaked at the last minute by a liberal Democratic Senator. I wonder where it is all going to stop.

#### LET US COMPROMISE ON UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BILL

On the issue of extending unemployment benefits, we know what the President will and will not sign.

Why can we not work together on a temporary bill which is properly funded? Why do we have to change permanently the unemployment law or why do we have to insist that the President has to declare a national emergency?

□ 1240

Madam Speaker, we know what he will agree to. I ask, "Why can't we do what is right, and let's get working for the best interests of the American people?"

#### WE NEED AN ENERGY POLICY THAT IS NOT DEPENDENT ON FOREIGN OIL

Mr. SARPALIUS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] yield under his reservation?

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

Is there an objection?

Mr. WALKER. There is no objection, Madam Speaker.

Mr. SARPALIUS. Madam Speaker, a year ago this country stepped across the ocean as a military giant and crushed the army of Saddam Hussein only to leave him still in power. I submit that at that time, when we brought our troops there, we went there not only to liberate Kuwait, but to protect the oil reserves in Saudi Arabia. And why? Because at that time this country depended on over 50 percent of our oil reserves from overseas and from the Middle East.

Madam Speaker, we fought that war, and we won that war, but I had hoped that when we brought our troops back home that we would have had the leadership in the White House for somebody to demand an energy policy in this country which moves away from our dependency on foreign oil and started utilizing the natural resources that we have right here at home.

Madam Speaker, that leadership was not there, and today we are still depending on over 50 percent of our oil reserves from the Middle East.

#### THE TIME HAS COME FOR ALL OF US TO UNITE FOR PEACE IN CROATIA AND YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to read from papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] reading from papers?

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, we are of course, not going to object to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] either reading from papers or giving a 1-minute. I am curious as to why the objections are being made only on one side of the aisle to the application of the rules. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has made no objections on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, would the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] yield under his reservation?

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] for yielding because what we observed yesterday in the process of the House was that the Chair was perfectly willing to discipline Members on our side of the aisle, but seemed reluctant to do so on the other side of the aisle, and the point is that we did have a serious violation of the rules. The majority then voted to take away all discipline at that point from objection. In fact, the Chair itself moved that the Member can continue as though the slate was wiped clean.

So, Madam Speaker, it appears very clear to this Member that we have a dual set of standards in the House with regard to who has to obey the rules and who does not, and so I must admit that I am being somewhat selective here, and I am simply trying to assure those who yesterday took it upon themselves to violate the rules and then wipe the slate clean that all I am seeking to do is have an assurance that they would obey the rules today. What I found was that regular order was demanded, I could not get that assurance, and so I kind of ratcheted up a notch with other rules that are applicable.

But I would simply say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] that all I am attempting to do is see to it that the rules that we laid down at the beginning of the Congress that are supposed to protect the minority not be used only as a weapon against it, that they are, in fact, obeyed by everyone in the House. They voted for those rules; I did not. But I am prepared to obey them. Evidently there are many on their side who are not prepared to obey them, and I must tell the gentleman that that is something which

bothers me as a Member of this body very greatly.

Madam Speaker, I think the protection of minority rights ought to be something in the context of how we operate the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, reclaiming my time, and on behalf of the majority, we are certainly not going to object to Members in the minority giving their 1-minute speeches and reading from papers, if they so desire.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, just over a month ago the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and I visited war-torn Croatia, including Zagreb, Osijek and Vukovar, and saw firsthand the devastation of the war. Our meetings with President Tudjman in Zagreb and President Milosevic in Belgrade stressed the compelling need for military restraint, preservation of human rights on both sides, a sustainable cease-fire and negotiations to resolve differences. Sadly, the Serbian-controlled Yugoslavia military and Serb irregulars have accelerated their offensive into Croatia and today are killing and maiming thousands with mortar and tank fire and fighter bomber attacks. About a third of Croatia is now under Serb control.

Madam Speaker, in place today is yet another cease-fire. Perhaps this will work where the others have failed. However, it seems to me much more needs to be done by the United States to foster peace in Yugoslavia. The EC cannot do it alone. We are heartened by the United Nation's appointment of Cy Vance as Secretary General Perez de Cuellar's personal envoy to Yugoslavia, but it seems to me that the President must speak out very boldly, as he did when the aggression against Kuwait took place by Iraq.

Madam Speaker, the time has come for all of us to unite for peace in Croatia and Yugoslavia.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT OF 1991

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SANDERS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been called for.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] continue to reserve the right to object, or does he withdraw his request?

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, has the gentleman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] asked unanimous consent to be able to read from papers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. She has not.

Mr. WALKER. She has not. I thank the Chair.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Madam Speaker, I think we are now beginning to focus on the Hill about the tremendous inequalities that women have in the workplace in any number of ways. Therefore, I am pleased to join with my colleagues in the congressional caucus for women's issues to introduce the Economic Equity Act of 1991.

The caucus first introduced the EEA 10 years ago, and has introduced it in every Congress since. While over the years the issues have changed, the need for a package of legislation to address women's economic needs has not.

Women continue to earn 68 cents for every dollar men earn. Women and their children still make up the vast majority of Americans living in poverty.

Our Nation has undergone dramatic changes over the last decade. Women now nearly equal men in the work force. Women are the majority of new entrants into the work force, the majority of people starting new businesses are women, and yet we still are not treated as partners in our Nation's future.

This year's Economic Equity Act responds to these changes in society. It places new emphasis on developing the job skills of women, and opening up new opportunities in the work force. By providing women with the skills to qualify for higher-paying jobs, we will not only improve the condition of women but will also move our economy into the 21st century.

I urge my colleagues to join with me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

#### IN MEMORY OF THE LATE PATRIARCH DEMETRIOS I

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks, and to read from papers.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, I rise today to express my sadness over the passing last week of one of the

world's great religious leaders—Patriarch Demetrios I.

Some in this Chamber may not realize it, but after the Catholic Church, the Orthodox Church is the largest Christian body in the world with 6 million Orthodox Christians in the United States, and millions of followers in Russia, Eastern Europe and elsewhere.

Patriarch Demetrios was installed in 1972 and was the 269th successor to St. Andrew, the Apostle. He was a man truly dedicated to Christian unity. In 1987, the Patriarch and the Pope recited the Liturgy of the Word together, the first time in a millennium that the Pope and the Orthodox Patriarch have joined together in reading the Liturgy.

Patriarch Demetrios was the leader of the Greek Orthodox community in the United States—and all Orthodox Christians are saddened by his passing. Madam Speaker, I ask that all of my colleagues pause and reflect on the Patriarch. May his legacy live on forever.

#### HELPING WOMEN MOVE INTO THE BUSINESS MAINSTREAM

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. SANDERS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] continue to reserve the right to object?

Mr. WALKER. No, Madam Speaker. I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KAPTUR. Madam Speaker, I rise today with many of my colleagues to introduce a title of the Women's Equity Act of 1992, the title dealing with women's business procurement, an extremely important title because, as we sit here today, less than 1 percent of Federal Government contracts go to women business owners. Less than 1 percent. It is an absolutely incredible number, and the Federal Government can provide an important lead in helping women in our society move into the business mainstream.

□ 1250

The purpose of the procurement title is to establish goals within each Federal agency for women's business procurement, and also within the Small Business Administration to establish an Office of Women's Enterprise and make sure that the other departments and agencies of the Federal Government are working to meet those goals.



Madam Speaker, please join us, the women's caucus, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER], the gentlewoman from Maine [Ms. SNOWE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE], the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, in supporting the Women's Equity Act of 1992.

#### MAKE HOUSE BANK RECORDS PUBLIC

Mr. JAMES. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to read from papers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAMES. Madam Speaker, last week this House voted to close the bank and refer the matter to the Ethics Committee. The American people are not satisfied.

Madam Speaker, it's time to make the bank records public. Until we do, all of us are suspect.

Those, like myself, who never bounced a check and those who were accidentally overdrawn twenty bucks are as suspect as those who may have been routinely overdrawn for months.

People don't believe the Ethics Committee will condemn Members who were routinely overdrawn. People assume the House leadership knew what Members were doing and didn't object. But the voters didn't know; and they do object.

We bring this House into disrepute by keeping secret from the voters facts about their Representatives that they demand and have a right to know.

Three quarters of this House did not abuse our banking privileges. Our good name is being used now to cover those who did, just as our bank balances had been used to cover those who were overdrawn. That's wrong.

Sunshine, full disclosure, Madam Speaker, and individual responsibility, is the only way to clear the name of the House.

#### THE TIME TO CHOOSE SIDES

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to read from two pieces of paper.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. APPELEGATE. Madam Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, what was the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS]?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] was to speak for 1 minute, to revise and extend, and to read from two pieces of paper.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I thank the Chair.

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would ask that the request of the gentleman be divided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] to proceed for 1 minute?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] to revise and extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] reading from paper?

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] may proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. SANDERS. Madam Speaker, there is little that we in Congress can do if the President chooses to veto legislation which is in the best interests of working people, the elderly and the poor. He has already indicated his desire to veto legislation which will extend unemployment benefits; to veto legislation which will provide a parental leave program for America's workers and to veto legislation which will protect the rights of striking workers.

Madam Speaker, if the President chooses to represent the interests of the rich and the powerful, that is his prerogative. But if we are sincere about representing the needs of ordinary Americans—then this is what we must do.

We must pass a single-payer, national health care program which will guarantee health care for all Americans. Let him veto it—if he dares.

We must pass a tax reform bill which finally ask the rich, whose incomes have soared, to start paying their fair share of taxes—so that the middle class can get a long deserved tax break. Let him veto it—if he dares.

Now that the cold war is over, we must significantly lower military spending and use the savings to create millions of jobs for American workers as we rebuilt our cities and towns; our declining industrial base, our rotting

infrastructure. Let him veto that legislation—if he dares.

Madam Speaker, the President has made it clear as to which side of the economic fence he is on—whose interests he represents. The time is now for us to make it clear as to whose side we are on.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, was it the opinion of the Chair that the previous speaker, the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. SANDERS] did not read from papers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Chair cannot see that the gentleman is reading his remarks. The gentleman has a right to have note paper in front of him. The Chair does not rule that a Member may not refer to a note.

#### REAUTHORIZE SMALL BUSINESS INNOVATION RESEARCH ACT

Mr. IRELAND. Madam Speaker, I request unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. IRELAND. Madam Speaker, just about a decade ago, a group of us in Congress realized that small businesses—the major source of innovation in this country—were being denied access to research and development funds within Federal departments and agencies.

In 1982, we established the Small Business Innovation Research Program to make sure that smaller firms were getting their fair share.

Yesterday, the Small Business Committee held the second of a series of hearings leading up to reauthorizing the SBIR Program next year.

And guess what we're finding out? This is one Federal program that actually works! The 11 participating Federal agencies have granted almost 19,000 competitive awards to small businesses—awards worth more than \$2.2 billion over 10 years.

Obviously, this program has created jobs and improved our economic performance at home. Equally important, it has cultivated a new source of innovative products that has improved our competitive edge in the global marketplace.

This is one Federal program that does what it's supposed to do. It deserves to be reauthorized.

And so, I urge my colleagues to remember when it's time to reauthorize the SBIR Program—it's easy to say you're all for small business, but it's how you vote that really counts.

## THE FORGOTTEN MIDDLE CLASS

Mr. APPLEGATE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and refer to notes.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Madam Speaker, regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded. Is there objection?

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, can the Chair repeat what the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE] was?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio asked to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend, and to refer to notes.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I ask that the motion be divided.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE] to proceed for 1 minute?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE] to revise and extend his remarks?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that with regard to the previous request to speak and read from notes, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows, according to the rules one may not read from notes if there is an objection unless permitted by the House. The Chair previously indicated she cannot tell if a Member is reading from a paper or in fact referring to a note. One may refer to a note without having permission of the Chair.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, if the Chair cannot see whether or not Members are violating the rules of the House, who is it that is going to enforce the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Members who object to what they observe is happening.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, as I understand it, there is a series of unanimous-consent requests now before us, and I am within my rights then to respond to that series of requests. The Chair has yet to pose the one that I am probably going to have problems with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has ruled that there is no rule of the House that a speaker cannot refer

to a note. That is all the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE] asked.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, the gentleman asked unanimous consent to refer to notes. Was that the request of the gentleman?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE] did not have to ask that. The rule is if there is an objection, a Member may not read their remarks unless permitted by the House. The Chair ruled that one can refer to a note. The gentleman asked to refer to a note.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. APPLEGATE] is recognized for 1 minute.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the parliamentary point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], would this preclude the President of the United States using a teleprompter during the State of the Union Address?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] that the Chair is in control of parliamentary inquiry. The Chair has ruled on this question. The Question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN] does not apply to this situation.

□ 1300

Mr. APPLEGATE. Madam Speaker, I do not know how many of my colleagues read Frank & Ernest, the comic strip. Here is a comic strip, and Frank says to Ernie, "Did you read that President Bush says the economy is improving?" And Ernie says, "No, I cannot afford to buy a newspaper."

Then the AP has one here that says "Recession Causes No Pain for the Richest," and inside it talks about the Fortune 500 who control nearly \$300 billion in this country.

There is 6 times more billionaires in this country than there was when Reagan came in in 1981. Who are these people?

They are not people that are without health insurance. They are not people that are on unemployment compensation. They are not people who worry about putting food on the table, clothes on their kid's back and education. No.

What about the unfortunate who are suffering from the social and economic disease, the middle income people who have gone down hill, becoming low-income? They need a break.

The Government will not help. They will remember us if we forget them.

## INVITATION TO MEETING

(Mrs. BENTLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend her re-

marks and to read from paper and notes.)

Mrs. BENTLEY. Madam Speaker, 1 week ago today Bishop Lukihan and other Serbian Orthodox priests were captured in the vicinity of their diocese in Pakrac, Slovenia, which is part of Croatia. Not a word has been heard from the Croatian Government as to the whereabouts or status of those clergy from the Serbian Orthodox Church, despite a number of inquiries from the U.S. Embassy.

Members and their staffs who are interested in learning more about this unfortunate civil war between the Croats and the Serbians in Krajina and Croatia may meet at 3 o'clock today in Longworth, room 1416, with Metropolitan Jovan who heads up the Serbian Orthodox Diocese in Krajina and who himself has been the victim of violence in recent weeks.

## WOMEN IN THE WORKPLACE

Mrs. UNSOELD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, I demand regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Regular order has been demanded. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WALKER. I could not hear the gentlewoman's request. Can she tell us what her request was?

Mrs. UNSOELD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Madam Speaker, harassment in the workplace takes many forms, sometimes at enormous public cost.

Madam Speaker, nearly two-thirds of the women in the workplace are those who are either the sole supporter of their family or are the difference between that family living in poverty or not. They are just trying to keep their families afloat. Yet these women earn on an average only 58 percent of what their male counterparts earn.

All these hard-working women are asking is to have the opportunity, equal opportunity for support of their families and respect in the workplace.



Today the legislation that we are introducing will help women achieve this economic equity. We need to know why it is that men performing the same tasks are paid so much more than women. We need to encourage women to enter nontraditional jobs. We need to find ways for women to break through the glass ceiling.

We can help women help themselves and help their families. I stand with my colleagues in support of the Economic Equity Act.

#### THE UNITED STATES MUST DECIDE ON CROATIA

(Mr. KASICH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to read from papers.)

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, at this moment there is a cease-fire in Yugoslavia, but it is hard to believe it will last any longer than the previous six ceasefires. The European Community has bungled its mediation effort, while the United States has sat on its hands. Meanwhile, the killing has gone on for months.

The Yugoslav situation is complicated, but not too complicated to discern right from wrong. The Croatian people seek independence from one of the last hard-line Communist States on Earth. The Communist Serbian leadership seeks to keep Croatia shackled to a State that no longer has legitimacy. The Communist-dominated Serbian military has stooped to indiscriminate bombing of cities. America shouldn't have a double standard on human rights: What was wrong in Kuwait or in the Baltics is equally wrong in Croatia.

Madam Speaker, this Government bears at least some responsibility. In June, Secretary Baker spoke out on the need to preserve the Yugoslav State. In retrospect, this has encouraged Serbian hardliners in the belief that the United States would tolerate unlimited force against Croatia. Mr. Speaker, it is time the United States Government faced reality and recognized the independence of Croatia and demand an end to Serbian violence against Croatia.

#### FOREIGN AID BILL

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, serving the right to object, I do so simply to inquire of the gentleman whether he intends to comply with all the rules of the House in delivering his 1-minute speech.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, I demand regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

Mr. WALKER. Regular order has not been properly demanded. I renew my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct, somebody has to stand to demand regular order.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, I demand regular order.

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman for an answer to my question.

#### PARLIAMENTARY ORDER

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is a question pending.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserved the right to object, and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman, but I do control the time at this moment.

Mr. DURBIN. Would the Speaker be kind enough to explain to this gentleman: It is my understanding that the gentleman wishes to pose a question to the Chair, and he can certainly do so for the Chair to respond. I do not believe it is within the rules for the gentleman to pose a question to individual Members about to take their 1-minute speeches.

Mr. WALKER. Under my reservation to object, I control the time, and I can in fact pose questions of other Members on the floor. The gentleman ought to check his rule book.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, now that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has ruled, would the gentlewoman please rule?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is reserving the right to object. That is all the gentleman from Pennsylvania is doing is reserving the right to object.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Speaker, I will repeat my request. I request the ability to revise and extend my remarks and to address the House for 1 minute.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so to ask the question whether he intends to comply with the rules of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana may respond.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Speaker, I would be happy to respond. Ever since I have been here in January, I have complied with the rules of the House when I have spoken. I intend to do so today.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. ROEMER. Madam Speaker, today in America we have a horrible

disconnect between what we discuss here in this body and pass in terms of legislation and what we hear from our districts. Sometimes that is because of the dilatory tactics taking place, sometimes that is because of the legislation that we put before us. We will be debating in the next few days, Madam Speaker, a \$25 billion foreign aid bill.

I will be voting against this bill until we can debate restructuring of foreign aid, until we can debate ways by which we help our businesses and farmers export with that foreign aid, and until we begin to debate some of the things here at home, like the pension losers bill, like family and medical leave.

#### MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS WEEK, INCOMPETENT VETER- ANS—H.R. 1473

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, as a result of the passage of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, service-connected disability compensation payments were discontinued to certain disabled veterans who have no dependents, who are rated incompetent and whose estates, excluding the value of their home, exceed \$25,000. The law, enacted as a quick-fix to meet budget targets, has been cited by the Disabled American Veterans [DAV] as unconstitutional and has a discriminatory affect against the mentally disabled veterans.

To discontinue these service-related disability benefits is to unfairly target veterans on the basis of mental capacity and marital status. Moreover, singling out disabled veterans who are incompetent is counterproductive and highly unfair. Because of the severity of their disabilities, these individuals need to build up their personal assets in order to provide for future medical needs and other significant expenses related to their disabilities.

This bill cuts to the heart of what it means to be a veteran. It is the understanding of every veteran, and of the Nation in general, that disability benefits paid to a serviceman with a service-related disability are the entitlement of that individual who served his country. These are not welfare benefits.

Last, many family members who serve as conservators, fiduciaries, and the representative payees of their veteran relatives, do this without expense to the veteran. To argue that reinstated compensation benefits would be an unjust enrichment for these people—as some have in the past—would be a gross injustice.

Benefits that our Nation pays to incompetent veterans are only a minute expression of our gratitude for the tremendous sacrifices these individuals made. Congress should not renege on its commitment to these heroic men. Please cosponsor this bill and repeal the ill-conceived reduction of benefits for these select veterans.

□ 1310

# A SALUTE TO THE LONG BEACH NAVAL SHIPYARD

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. DURBIN. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois has called for regular order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. I was not able to hear what the gentleman from California requested of the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman repeat his request?

Mr. ANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and address the House for 1 minute, and I do have notes in front of me, as I always do, and I assume that if you are smart enough, you would, too.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. WALKER. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Madam Speaker. There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to take a minute to salute the dedicated men and women of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard.

Last Friday, October 3, the employees of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard completed a complete overhaul of the U.S.S. *Belleau Wood*, a landing helicopter amphibious vessel. Most importantly, this overhaul was done on time and at \$3 million under the budget.

In this body, we are constantly hearing about time delays and cost overruns, so I want to remind my colleagues of the kind of jobs that a skilled and highly motivated work force like that of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard can do. This achievement is also a tribute to the Base Closure and

Realignment Commission, which recommended that the shipyard remain open, and to those Members of Congress who supported, who voted to support, the Commission's findings.

The Long Beach Naval Shipyard fulfilled the vital service to the defense and security of this Nation, and it does so with a standard of quality and cost efficiency second to none.

This successful overhaul demonstrates what can be done by people—

Mr. WALKER. I object to the gentleman reading from papers.

Mr. ANDERSON [continuing]. Committed to a purpose, and what an asset such people are to the people of the United States, and it is with great pride that I salute the crew of the U.S.S. *Belleau Wood*.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. And the employees of the Long Beach Naval Shipyard on a job well done.

Thank you very much.

## PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I did, as the Chair instructed me earlier, I objected to the reading from papers on the floor, and the Chair does not appear to be willing to enforce the rule despite the fact that there was an objection from the Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Chair responds in that in this situation the time had expired before the objection was made.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I think if the Chair would go back and check, the Chair would find that I objected well before the gavel came down.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair's ruling is the time had expired.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

## AMERICA SHOULD BE A STRONG VOICE FOR FREEDOM IN THE WORLD

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks and to refer to notes.

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

Mr. ECKART. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An objection has been heard.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. I understand, Madam Speaker.

Mr. WALKER. He objected to you speaking.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. To speaking or referring to notes?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the gentleman from California proceeding for 1 minute?

Mr. ECKART. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ECKART. Madam Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. An objection has been heard.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Is there an objection to my using notes or an objection to me speaking?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has raised the objection for the gentleman to speak for 1 minute.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Period?

## HOW TO MAKE THE DAY EASIER

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for a moment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, let me suggest, if I might in the interests of the House, that the rest of the afternoon and the week will go much better if we continue to let this roll out, and I would hope that if the gentleman from California would ask again for the right to speak for 60 seconds that both sides would allow that to happen.

I would just think it would make the rest of the day much easier.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I think that will occur. I hope it will occur. And, again, we understand that both sides have their perspective, but for the most part, I think all of us try to be fair to one another in this House. That has been my observation over the 10-plus years I have been here. Others may have a different perspective, but I agree with the gentleman that we ought to proceed with the important business confronting this country.

There are lot of people in pain in this country, and they must be in great pain watching their Legislature, what they perceive, I am sure, as playing games.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am sure most people who are so proud of what has happened in the Soviet Union and elsewhere are proud to see an effort to maintain the legislative process and understand that enforcing the rules sometimes is a prerequisite of the legislative process. But while I think it is reasonable for both sides to occasionally inquire about the reading of papers and others, I would hope that neither side would engage in stopping Members from ultimately asking unanimous consent to speak.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California repeat his request?

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, revise and extend my remarks, and speak without notes.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER] for 1 minute.

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Madam Speaker, I might note that yesterday the big brouhaha over whether or not people were going to obey the rules and whether or not we were going to have the rules enforced started with an attempt by the other side of the aisle to silence me, and then there was a retaliation from our side.

Let me note that for the purpose of my 1-minute today it is to suggest that America should be a strong voice for freedom in the world, and that is what I was hoping to express today.

The fact is the people of China are languishing under a dictatorship. The people of Burma and Croatia, there is aggression being committed. Men and women and children are losing their lives, and I perceive that this administration and I perceive that the United States is not speaking up with a strong voice for freedom, and a voice for decency that this country is supposed to be all about.

I would hope the people in Burma understand that we are with them and not their dictatorship, that the people of China understand that we are with them and not the dictatorship, and the people who languish under tyranny anywhere will continue to know that the United States is not just anti-Communist but that the United States is a force for freedom in the world and will continue to be a force for freedom in the world.

#### SUPPORT DEMOCRACY IN HAITI

Mr. OWENS of New York. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. Reserving the right to object, I do so simply to inquire of the gentleman whether he would be willing to comply with the rules of the House.

Mr. ECKART. Regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WALKER. Is it my understanding that the gentleman from New York has not requested of the House to read from papers?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] for 1 minute.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Madam Speaker, United States policy on Haiti continues to be part of the problem and not part of the solution.

This administration has given the impression that President Aristide, who was elected by 70 percent of the electorate in a legal election, is no better than the military murderers who have taken over the Government. Aristide has been lectured about some violations of human rights, and the impression is being given that the people who are replacing him are as good as he is, and yet they have murdered hundreds of people in the streets of Haiti including a Haitian-American citizen who resides in my district.

The military murderers, thugs, and bandits in uniforms have taken over because the wrong signal has been sent by the U.S. Government. We continue to side with the military. We continue to pay the salaries of the military. We are the people who train the military.

Whenever the military rises up, it is because they have gotten a signal from our Government. We should end our hypocrisy and support democracy in Haiti.

#### BRING UP SIGNABLE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE BILL

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, without any notes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia for 1 minute.

Mr. GINGRICH. Madam Speaker, I just want to say it is my understanding that after our resolution yesterday urging the leadership to move the unemployment bill, that it has in fact gone to the White House in the last few minutes.

I believe it will be vetoed by the President. The other body, of course, has adjourned until next week. I hope that if it is vetoed and sustained early next week, and I would hope the Demo-

cratic leadership would bring it to the floor and not hold it up, I would hope that then within 48 hours we could bring to the floor a signable bill, something like the Republican unemployment bill which would give 10 additional weeks of extended unemployment to some 3 million people.

I think it is far better for us to send out checks to 3 million people for 10 weeks then to continue to play political games in the House.

I thank the leadership for finally, 8 days late, moving the bill down to the White House. I hope we can move expeditiously, and on our side, we will ask to bring up an unemployment bill within 48 hours of the time that the current bill is sustained, if it is vetoed.

□ 1320

#### NIGHT CALM ACROSS AMERICA SHATTERED BY CRACK OF SEMI-AUTOMATIC WEAPONS

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

Mr. DURBIN. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHUMER. Madam Speaker, in New York City where I live, in Stockton, CA, in Louisville, KY, and in towns and cities throughout America the night calm is being shattered by the crack of semiautomatic weapons. These are the sounds of death bursting from the barrels of semiautomatics. These weapons have names like Striker 12, Street Sweeper, Kalashnikov, and every one of them conjures up the image of a lifeless young man laying in the gutter.

Madam Speaker, we can put an end to that next week. In the crime bill there will be an attempt to abolish these weapons, weapons that no hunter uses, no person who wants to defend himself or herself uses. The only people who use these weapons are people who want to kill other people.

Now, I know that powerful political forces have spread lies about the bill, that it will take away hunters' weapons. It does not. That it will allow some bureaucrat to take away weapons. They do not.

Madam Speaker, I hope this body will rise to the occasion and ban assault weapons once and for all.

## CIVILITY ON THE FLOOR

Mr. LAROCCO. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

Mr. DURBIN. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAROCCO. Madam Speaker, last week I went to a dinner. We all go to dinners in Washington, DC, to honor people. I went to a dinner that honored Bryce Harlow last week, a great American, a public servant, a Republican, and at that dinner the distinguished minority leader gave a speech about, of all things in this town, civility.

The distinguished minority leader said, "What would it be like if we had civility breaking out all over this town?"

It was a moving speech. It was a speech about the institutions and the people who have made this country great, not tearing it down, but building it up. It was a great speech, and I recommend it to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] to read.

## A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEORGE RUSSELL

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

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

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

Mr. SCHUMER. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, regular order has not been properly demanded by the gentleman.

Mr. SCHUMER. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has now been properly demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DURBIN. Madam Speaker, in the history of the U.S. House of Representatives, some 12,000 men and women have had the opportunity to serve in this great body. In this very Chamber in which I speak today literally hundreds, if not thousands of the most important figures in American political life have walked this floor, have given speeches from this podium.

Amidst all this pomp and all the titled individuals here, there are many men and women who serve this House in anonymity, men and women who lit-

erally give their lives to this country and this institution unselfishly. One such person was George Lewis Russell. The name may not be familiar to many Americans, but if you have watched C-SPAN over the last few years, George Russell was the gentleman, the black American who sat behind the podium on the Republican side of the aisle and you saw him many times.

During the 9 years that I have been privileged to serve in the House of Representatives, it has been my honor to come to know so many men and women who make this institution so great. George Russell was just such a person. He was a friendly person, a happy person, always with a smile on his face, and dedicated to his job and this institution.

George Russell passed away last Friday. The House of Representatives has lost a great friend and a great person.

I would like to extend to his family, and particularly to his wife, the Reverend Helen Russell, his children, grandchildren, and sisters, our sympathy and to say to George Russell, "We will remember you for many years to come."

## THE ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT

Mrs. LLOYD. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to read from a paper.

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

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

Mrs. BOXER. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mrs. LLOYD. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join with a number of my distinguished colleagues in sponsoring the Economic Equity Act.

This comprehensive package includes a number of provisions fashioned to address economic issues which impact women and their families. The bill's four titles—employment opportunities, women in business, economic justice, and retirement equity—reflect this broad agenda.

Each year more and more women enter the work force out of necessity. The number of female headed households has more than doubled over the past 27 years. Nearly 17 percent of all families are headed by a woman. These statistics reflect tough economic times which often warrant two incomes for families to make ends meet and put food on the table.

In many cases women are raising children alone and are responsible for caring for elderly parents as well. To

these women, and many others, a paycheck cannot be called a luxury—it is an absolute necessity. This bill will help provide women with the skills they need to effectively compete in the work force and help the American economy compete in the global market. It is essential that it be enacted.

One reason that many American women and their families are struggling financially is because child support payments are in arrears. I am particularly pleased that this bill includes language to strengthen child support statutes. I feel it is imperative that child support payment be collected and that every effort be made to see that delinquent parents are brought to justice.

This measure would require that States pass laws enforcing a 10-day time limit for employers turning over garnished wages to State child support enforcement agencies. The bill would also revise existing regulations to allow child support enforcement agencies increased access to financial information when reviewing and determining the noncustodial parents financial obligation.

I am hopeful that efforts such as this will help ease the tremendous burden often faced by individuals who are the primary caretakers of their children.

Please join me in supporting the Economic Equity Act. This bill will go a long way toward responding to the changing needs of American women in the workplace and at home.

## A TRIBUTE TO THE LATE GEORGE RUSSELL

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from California is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. DORNAN of California. Madam Speaker, I was back in the Cloakroom and was thoroughly shocked to hear about the passing of a gentleman who was a dear friend to all of us. His handsome, smiling face is probably known to this country because of C-SPAN as much as any Member of majority of minority leader of this great legislative body.

George was a friend for 15 years. I concur with all the beautiful and eloquent remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], and I also want to emphasize how much he is missed and will be missed on both sides of the aisle.

He was truly a distinguished gentleman, George Russell.

## THE GLASS CEILING PROBLEM FOR WOMEN

Mrs. BOXER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the



House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

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

Mr. WALKER. I reserve the right to object, Madam Speaker.

Mr. HOYER. Regular order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Regular order has been demanded.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOXER. Madam Speaker, in the last couple days we have really seen the focus and the spotlight on problems that women face in the workplace. We know from recent studies that the first problem is equal pay for equal work.

We know the second problem is sexual harassment in the workplace.

Now the Congressional Caucus for Women's Issues has gotten together and has put together a very important package of bills that deal with employment opportunities; a bill, for example, by my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] deals with the glass ceiling problem.

They deal with women in business. They deal with economic justice, legislative pay equity, and a bill that I was fortunate enough to put together called the Federal Council on Women, which would once and for all establish a council that could advise Congress on what the problems are and what we have to do to help women perform in the workplace, get out of poverty, and add to the great productivity of the greatest Nation on Earth.

Madam Speaker, I hope you will all support that.

#### CIVILITY OFTEN A ONE-WAY STREET

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

Mr. WALKER. Madam Speaker, what I find in this body is that civility is often a one-way street. The reason for this little exercise this morning was because yesterday we saw a pattern develop on the House floor which indicated the rule of law was not going to be followed in the House.

The only protection for the minority is that we obey the rules we set forth. The minority does not vote for those rules, only the majority does; but ultimately we have to live by them.

What we have seen developing is an unfairness where the rules only apply to the minority, but whenever the majority violates them the majority then just wipes the slate clean and goes on. It does not matter whether it is the House Bank, or it does not matter whether it is the House Restaurant or the ways we proceed on the House floor. The fact is that the majority wipes the slate clean and goes forward.

I would say from my standpoint, the only thing I was attempting to do today was to point out that if in fact we cannot live by the rule of law, we ought to at least request the individual Members to live by the rule of law. That was not allowed me. I was not permitted to ask that question of the individual Members, and so it became ratcheted up a little bit.

I would hope at least that if we are going to proceed in the future in ways that ensure the House does the right thing, we do so with civility, but also under law.

□ 1330

#### THE AMERICAN PEOPLE EXPECT CONGRESS TO ACT IN TIMES OF CRISIS, NOT PLAY GAMES

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

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, there has been some mention of civility by a number of speakers, and that is appropriate. The American public expects and we on our side of the aisle try to comply with that expectation, not only that they have but that we have of ourselves, with making sure that every Member has the opportunity to address this House, without harassment, without having one's motives questioned preliminarily, without asking a Member whether they intend to obey the rules of the House, because we presume that every, every—and underline "every"—Member on both sides of the aisle of whatever party or independence, intends to follow the rules.

The American public expects us to pursue substance. They expect us to act in times of economic crisis, to help the unemployed, they expect us to act, not play games, in the face of rising crisis in health care premiums. They expect us to act on their behalf.

Madam Speaker, let us do it.

#### JOB TRAINING REFORM AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). The unfinished business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3033, 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 Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3033, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 420, nays 6, not voting 7, as follows:

Abercrombie  
Ackerman  
Alexander  
Allard  
Anderson  
Andrews (ME)  
Andrews (NJ)  
Andrews (TX)  
Annunzio  
Anthony  
Applegate  
Archer  
Armey  
Aspin  
Atkins  
AuCoin  
Bacchus  
Baker  
Ballenger  
Barrett  
Barton  
Bateman  
Bellenson  
Bennett  
Bentley  
Bereuter  
Berman  
Bevill  
Bilbray  
Bilirakis  
Billey  
Boehlert  
Boehner  
Bonior  
Borski  
Boucher  
Boxer  
Brewster  
Brooks  
Broomfield  
Browder  
Brown  
Bruce  
Bryant  
Bunning  
Burton  
Bustamante  
Byron  
Callahan  
Camp  
Campbell (CA)  
Campbell (CO)  
Cardin  
Carper  
Carr  
Chandler  
Chapman  
Clay  
Clement  
Clinger  
Coble  
Coleman (MO)  
Coleman (TX)  
Collins (MI)  
Combest  
Condit  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costello  
Coughlin  
Cox (CA)  
Cox (IL)  
Coyne  
Cramer  
Cunningham  
Darden  
Davis  
de la Garza  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
Dellums  
Derrick  
Dickinson  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Dixon  
Donnelly  
Dooley  
Doolittle  
Dorgan (ND)  
Dorman (CA)  
Downey  
Dreier

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—420

Duncan  
Durbine  
Dwyer  
Dymally  
Early  
Eckart  
Edwards (CA)  
Edwards (OK)  
Edwards (TX)  
Emerson  
Engel  
English  
Erdreich  
Espy  
Evans  
Ewing  
Fascell  
Fawell  
Fazio  
Feighan  
Fields  
Fish  
Flake  
Foglietta  
Ford (MI)  
Ford (TN)  
Frank (MA)  
Franks (CT)  
Frost  
Gallely  
Gallo  
Gaydos  
Gejdenson  
Gephardt  
Geren  
Gibbons  
Gilchrest  
Gillmor  
Gilman  
Gingrich  
Glickman  
Gonzalez  
Goodling  
Gordon  
Goss  
Gradison  
Grandy  
Green  
Guarini  
Gunderson  
Hall (OH)  
Hall (TX)  
Hamilton  
Hammerschmidt  
Hancock  
Hansen  
Harris  
Hastert  
Hatcher  
Hayes (IL)  
Hayes (LA)  
Hefley  
Henry  
Herger  
Hertel  
Hoagland  
Hobson  
Hochbrueckner  
Horn  
Horton  
Houghton  
Hoyer  
Hubbard  
Huckaby  
Hughes  
Hunter  
Hutto  
Hyde  
Inhofe  
Ireland  
Jacobs  
James  
Jefferson  
Jenkins  
Johnson (CT)  
Johnson (SD)  
Johnson (TX)  
Johnston  
Jones (GA)  
Jones (NC)  
Jontz  
Kanjorski  
Kaptur

Kasich  
Kennedy  
Kennelly  
Kildee  
Klecza  
Klug  
Kolbe  
Kolter  
Kopetski  
Kostmayer  
Kyl  
LaFalce  
Lagomarsino  
Lancaster  
Lantos  
LaRocco  
Laughlin  
Leach  
Lehman (CA)  
Lehman (FL)  
Lent  
Levin (MI)  
Levine (CA)  
Lewis (CA)  
Lewis (FL)  
Lewis (GA)  
Lightfoot  
Lipinski  
Livingston  
Lloyd  
Long  
Lowery (CA)  
Lowey (NY)  
Luken  
Machtley  
Manton  
Markey  
Marlenee  
Martin  
Martinez  
Matsui  
Mavroules  
Mazooli  
McCandless  
McCloskey  
McCollum  
McCrery  
McCurdy  
McDade  
McDermott  
McEwen  
McGrath  
McHugh  
McMillan (NC)  
McMillen (MD)  
McNulty  
Meyers  
Mfume  
Michel  
Miller (CA)  
Miller (OH)  
Miller (WA)  
Mineta  
Mink  
Moakley  
Molinaro  
Mollohan  
Montgomery  
Moody  
Moorhead  
Moran  
Morella  
Morrison  
Mrazek  
Murphy  
Murtha  
Myers  
Nagle  
Natcher  
Neal (MA)  
Neal (NC)  
Nichols  
Nowak  
Nussle  
Oakar  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olin  
Oliver  
Ortiz  
Orton  
Owens (NY)  
Owens (UT)

Oxley	Rowland	Sundquist
Packard	Roybal	Swett
Pallone	Russo	Swift
Panetta	Sabo	Synar
Parker	Sanders	Tallon
Pastor	Sangmeister	Tanner
Patterson	Santorum	Tauzin
Paxon	Sarpalius	Taylor (MS)
Payne (NJ)	Savage	Taylor (NC)
Payne (VA)	Sawyer	Thomas (CA)
Pease	Saxton	Thomas (GA)
Pelosi	Schaefer	Thomas (WY)
Penny	Scheuer	Thornton
Perkins	Schiff	Torres
Peterson (FL)	Schroeder	Torricelli
Peterson (MN)	Schulze	Towns
Petri	Schumer	Traficant
Pickett	Serrano	Traxler
Pickle	Sharp	Unsoeld
Porter	Shaw	Upton
Poshard	Shays	Valentine
Price	Shuster	Vander Jagt
Pursell	Sikorski	Vento
Quillen	Siskisky	Visclosky
Rahall	Skaggs	Volkmer
Ramstad	Skeen	Vucanovich
Rangel	Skelton	Walsh
Ravenel	Slatery	Waters
Ray	Slaughter (NY)	Waxman
Reed	Slaughter (VA)	Weber
Regula	Smith (FL)	Weiss
Rhodes	Smith (IA)	Weldon
Richardson	Smith (NJ)	Wheat
Ridge	Smith (OR)	Whitten
Riggs	Smith (TX)	Williams
Rinaldo	Snowe	Wilson
Ritter	Solarz	Wise
Roberts	Solomon	Wolf
Roe	Spence	Wolpe
Roemer	Spratt	Wyden
Rogers	Staggers	Wyllie
Rohrabacher	Stallings	Yates
Ros-Lehtinen	Stark	Yatron
Rose	Stearns	Young (AK)
Rostenkowski	Stenholm	Young (FL)
Roth	Stokes	Zeliff
Roukema	Studds	Zimmer

## NAYS—6

Crane	DeLay	Stump
Dannemeyer	Sensenbrenner	Walker

## NOT VOTING—7

Barnard	Hefner	Washington
Collins (IL)	Holloway	
Gekas	Hopkins	

□ 1352

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.

# WITHDRAWAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 858

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 858.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. KENNELLY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

# CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2942, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of yesterday, I call up the con-

ference report on the bill (H.R. 2942) making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1992, and for other purposes. The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 8, 1991, the conference report is considered as having been read. (For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 7, 1991, at page 25714.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report and amendments in disagreement on the bill, H.R. 2942.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, we bring before the House today the conference report on the fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations bill. This year, we had 163 amendments in conference, and I am pleased to report that we have resolved all amendments. The result is a package that I believe preserves a balanced transportation system for the Nation, and provides increases for our transportation infrastructure while meeting our overall budgetary constraints.

## OVERALL FUNDING SUMMARY

Madam Speaker, the conference agreement is a fiscally sound compromise. The total funding levels of \$14.3 billion in new budget authority and \$32.33 billion in outlays are within the revised 602(b) allocations, and in accord with the budget resolution passed by the House and the Senate. I would like to point out that the new budget authority provided in this conference agreement is approximately at the midpoint between the House- and Senate-passed bills. Outlays are lower than either the House- or Senate-passed bill.

## TRANSPORTATION PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

Madam Speaker, the details of the conference agreement are described in the statement of the managers. I would encourage the Members to review that statement, including the summary table at the end. However, I would like to highlight some of the more important items.

First, a total of \$17.5 billion in new budget authority and limitations on

obligations is provided for the Federal Highway Administration, an increase of \$2.4 billion, or 16 percent, over fiscal year 1991. The obligation limitation for the Federal-Aid Highways Program is set at \$16.8 billion, which is a \$2.3 billion increase over last year and a \$4.6 billion increase over the level provided just 2 years ago. This funding increase, when combined with other amounts for highways in the agreement, will put us well on the way to addressing the highway infrastructure needs of this Nation. No increase in the Federal tax on motor fuels is assumed in this agreement.

Second, the agreement provides a total program level of \$8.8 billion for the FAA, which is a 12-percent increase over fiscal year 1991. This includes an 8-percent increase in funding for operations, a 14-percent increase for facilities and equipment, and a limitation on obligations of \$1.9 billion for airport grants-in-aid. For those who believe that we should be drawing down the balance in the airport and airway trust fund, I would point out that the conference agreement provides that \$2.1 billion, or 48 percent, of FAA's operational expenses are to come from the trust fund.

Third, the agreement provides \$3.3 billion for the Coast Guard, a 9-percent increase over last year. It is assumed that \$185.1 million for Coast Guard activities will be financed in the DOD appropriations bill. An additional \$58.3 million has been reduced from the Coast Guard's budget request for activities more appropriately performed by the DOD.

Fourth, the agreement provides \$506 million for operations and capital improvements of Amtrak, and an additional \$205 million to continue infrastructure improvements in the Northeast corridor. This latter figure includes \$150.1 million for electrification and other improvements to reduce the travel time between New York and Boston.

Fifth, the agreement provides \$3.7 billion in new budget authority and limitations on obligations for the Urban Mass Transportation Administration [UMTA]. This includes \$1.9 billion in discretionary grants, a \$500 million, or 36 percent, increase over the fiscal year 1991 level.

Sixth, the bill includes the omnibus transportation employee testing act contained in the Senate bill. I would remind the Members that the House voted overwhelmingly to instruct the House conferees to accept the Senate position on this amendment. The agreement also includes the Aging Aircraft Safety Act, as contained in the House bill.

## SUMMARY

Madam Speaker, this agreement is a balanced compromise which protects the major provisions and interests of the House-passed bill. It has been de-



veloped in a bipartisan fashion with full participation by our conferees from the other side of the aisle. There have been some major compromises and tough decisions to get us to this point. The bill deserves the Members' support. I strongly urge its adoption.

□ 1400

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. FROST] for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. FROST. I thank the distinguished and able chairman for yielding time to me regarding a very important project in the Dallas-Fort Worth area. The FAA has asked both the House and the Senate for funding to improve the air traffic control system for the entire Dallas-Fort Worth area. This project, the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex Program, would increase the area's ability to manage air traffic in already congested skies.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida, was it not the intent of the House and Senate to appropriate \$53.5 million for this project?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. The gentleman is correct. The FAA in its original request to Congress did ask for \$53.5 million for this project.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to further inquire of the gentleman from Florida: Is it not the case then that the final amount allocated to this project was \$31.5 million and the reduced amount was asked for by the FAA?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. The gentleman is correct. The FAA did ask for cuts in this project. The FAA submitted to the House and Senate conferees a request that the \$53.5 million approved by both the House and Senate for the Dallas/Fort Worth Metroplex Program be cut to \$31.5 million.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his consideration.

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

Mr. Speaker, I urge strong support of the conference report to accompany the fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations bill.

Our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] has done a remarkable job both in getting the bill to and through the conference, which is no easy task, and in explaining the agreements which have been reached.

The conferees worked as a team to keep the country afloat, on the rails, on the roads, and in the air. These transportation goals are furthered in the conference report before the House today.

This conference agreement provides \$14.3 billion in new budget authority. This is \$808 million less than the President's budget request, \$137 million less than the Senate bill, but \$132 million more than the bill passed by the House last July.

When we include limitations on obligations, the conference agreement is \$35 billion. This is \$1.7 billion more than the President's budget request, \$740 million more than the House bill, but \$190 million less than the Senate bill.

This bill is not a budget buster. It has been scored by the Congressional Budget Office, and it is within our 602(b) allocation.

The Office of Management and Budget has so few worries about this bill that they have not even scored the conference agreement. The Department of Transportation supports it, and the Office of Management and Budget has indicated that although they are not wild about the projects in the bill, they will not recommend a veto.

Major agreements include \$2.32 billion in operating expenses for the Coast Guard, \$390 million in Coast Guard acquisition, construction, and improvements, including \$1 million to begin renovation of the cutter *Mackinaw* and enough funds for a third medium-range helicopter assigned to Florida and used in drug interdiction, and the full budget request for family housing.

The bill includes \$4.36 billion in operations for the Federal Aviation Administration, a 7.6-percent increase over fiscal year 1991. It includes \$2.394 billion for FAA facilities and equipment, about an 18-percent increase over last year.

It includes \$16.8 billion in highway obligation ceilings, approximately a 16-percent increase over last year. It includes \$589 million in various highway projects, new ones at 80 percent and ongoing at 90 percent. It includes \$205 million for the Northeast Corridor Improvement Program, including \$150 million in New York to Boston high-speed rail improvements and \$506 million in Amtrak grants, 52 percent over the budget; \$3.767 billion are included for mass transit programs, approximately 15 percent over the budget.

There is a general provision extending the 65-mile-an-hour speed limit for certain State highways that need interstate specifications.

As the chairman pointed out, a general provision providing the statutory authority for mandatory drug and alcohol testing of transportation professionals is included. The language of this amendment is identical to the Omnibus Transportation Employee Testing Acts sponsored by Senators DANFORTH and HOLLINGS which passed the other body 12 times and to the companion legislation sponsored in the House in the last 2 Congresses by the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] and myself.

On September 24 I did a motion to instruct the House conferees to accept the Senate language which passed by 413 yeas to 5 nays. Given our current financial situation, this is the best conference report we can bring to the House. I strongly urge its approval.

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

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished committee chairman for yielding time to me.

It has come to my attention that the ICC has not been actively enforcing statutory tariff requirements for motor carriers. While the ICC has acknowledged these requirements, nonetheless hundreds of tariffs have been filed with it that fail to provide any meaningful notice to the public as to the actual rates that will be applied to freight movements.

These tariffs are useless to the public and the ICC.

In its report accompanying this bill, the Senate Appropriations Committee has already expressed its deep concern about the proliferation of these unlawful tariffs and has vowed to keep a close eye on the ICC's future actions.

Is this a concern that the chairman shares?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I concur with the gentleman from West Virginia and share his concern.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE], the distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MCDADE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I will take just a few moments to indicate my strong support for this appropriations bill. It reflects a work product that we can all be proud of.

I want to commend the distinguished gentleman from Florida for the way he has crafted this bill. He and my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, have brought the House a bill that affects every segment of society in this Nation and does so in a very positive fashion. They have worked to compromise this bill to the extent that I know of no real objection at all to its passage.

□ 1410

It plays a vital role in the highway safety, transportation, and continuing growth of the economy in this country.

I want to pay a special tribute to my friend from Pennsylvania for enacting and working hard to enact a comprehensive program for drug testing for people in safety-related jobs. I know that he and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HUGHES] worked heavily in that area, and their work product is in this bill. I congratulate them. They were the Members who worked hard to make that happen, and without them it would not have happened.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is within the 602 allocation. I have no reservations about it, and I hope it will be passed.

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

Mr. MCDADE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I simply wanted to join in his remarks that he has made about the work of this subcommittee, both the ranking member and also my distinguished colleague from Florida who worked very, very diligently and ably to bring us a conference report where, as far as I know, there is absolutely no opposition. And it speaks well of the ability of the chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking member to resolve the problems not only between the parties, but between the Congress and the administration in order to get this conference report through. I just appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his leadership and his comments and him giving me the opportunity to join at this moment in the commendation of our members on the Appropriations Committee.

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

Mr. MCDADE. I thank my friend from Florida, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania for yielding and want to join in my colleague's comments in note of congratulations to the chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee and the ranking Republican, LARRY COUGHLIN, for an excellent job really. As our colleague from Florida has indicated, the very fact that it is not controversial when there were so many issues in contention is a great testament to the leadership of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee.

I particularly want to commend my colleague from Pennsylvania, LARRY COUGHLIN, for his work on the testing issue. That is something that has been kicking around a long time. It codifies testing and extends testing in the public service area. People have a right to know that those to whom they are consigned in the area of mass transportation are free of substance abuse and sober, and this would direct the Secretary, as my colleagues know, to promulgate regulations that would, in fact, put in place preemployment, random, reasonable suspicion, and post-accident testing with all of the safeguards that innocent individuals are entitled to, but at the same time protecting the traveling public.

So I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his efforts. It has been a privilege to work with him on this particular issue for several years now. I am very happy that at long last we are going to put in place those regulations that are essential for public safety.

Again, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

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

Mr. MCDADE. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank my colleague from New Jersey and say that it is his leadership that has made this possible, and we are grateful for that leadership in the Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. COLEMAN].

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an inquiry concerning the drug and alcohol testing of transportation personnel in safety-related jobs contained in this bill. Am I correct that in the conference committee meeting last week on this bill, there was an extended discussion in which it was agreed that this bill in its present form protects the rights of those employees who are tested by incorporating guidelines established by the Department of Health and Human Services [HHS] on laboratory accuracy through the medical review officer function?

I would like to confirm that this discussion ensued in the conference and that these above-mentioned individual protections are included in this bill.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, he is correct on both counts: The discussion did occur, and this bill specifically incorporates the HHS guidelines, published in the Federal Register on April 11, 1988, on laboratory accuracy through the medical review officer function.

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his response and also for his particular leadership in the movement of this conference report.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DELAY].

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report. Let me say from the outset that this is a good conference report—one that the committee spent many hours perfecting. I would like to thank my very able chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and my ranking member, Mr. COUGHLIN for their experience and expertise in crafting legislation that furthers many of this Nation's transportation needs and goals.

There is one issue, however, that I am concerned about. Over the past few years, I have witnessed a trend to move this Nation toward mass transit. I submit that mass transit has its benefits. However, I do not feel that it is the Government's role to spend taxpayers' dollars on forced mass transportation

systems. That is not the direction that our constituents want us to take and that is not the direction this committee should be going. I believe that mass transportation goals should be set by State and local governments. Support for those goals should include Federal legislators as well as a consensus from the public. Anything less would be transportation projects being forced on the public nationwide whether they like it or not.

I know first hand how the public feels when a particular policy is being literally shoved down their throats. The people of Houston know that feeling as well. The people of Houston have expressed their discontent over a monorail project because they realized that it would not meet the goals and objectives necessary to make it successful to operate. Moreover, they realized that transportation projects cost money—a great deal of money—and that transportation projects have to be funded for the most part, by them.

This conference report represents a victory for the overwhelming majority of the people of Houston.

They won, Mr. Speaker. The people of Houston were successful in defeating a failed project virtually nobody wanted.

A small group of supporters tried to push on the public their vision of a transportation system—whether it worked or not—and whether it was worth it or not. An overwhelming majority of the Houston area State and local government officials were against this monorail project and an overwhelming majority of the people were decidedly against the project. My poll of more than 2,100 calls, for example, ran about 9 to 1 against building the Houston monorail.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Houston won.

They realized that this 24-mile monorail system was going to serve few while costing a great deal of money. Not only that, the public knew that they would have to pay some \$200 million per year just to keep this relatively small rail system up and running. Further, they realized that the proposed system would not help congestion problems or help pollution—up and running. But better yet, the Houston public won because they knew that this was the beginning of an entire huge monorail network costing countless billions of dollars. That's not what the people of Houston want or need and, after months and months of careful study I shared their desire for something else—something better. I knew this particular monorail project was the wrong project to undertake. The State, local, and Federal officials knew, and most importantly, the people knew it was not worth the huge expense.

Many people have come to me asking what is right for Houston. Now that this particular monorail project is bur-



ied, what does Houston do now? Since I am the only one that is interested in building the consensus necessary to support any transportation undertaking, I will play that role the best I can. However, I feel that it is up to the people of Houston to decide what kind of transportation system they want to spend their hard earned tax dollars on.

I am not in the position to advocate any mode of transportation. I have not played that role in the past and will not take it on in the future. I will, however, be in position to assist Houston with their transportation needs in the future and will fight to achieve those goals.

There is a great deal of technology out there. Houston deserves the best available. I believe that they can have it. It is up to the city of Houston and their officials to realize what has happened here and develop a positive transportation plan that can be supported successfully. Houston is a "can-do" city. Some officials that supported the monorail plan have stated that the city of Houston can't develop a new transportation strategy quickly and that a year is simply not enough time. To that, Mr. Speaker, I say that bigger problems have been overcome in a shorter amount of time. Where there is a will there is a way. I sincerely hope to have the distinct opportunity to assist Houston in the future with their transportation goals and objectives that serve all of Houston.

□ 1420

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report on H.R. 2942, making appropriations for the Department of Transportation. In particular, I wish to thank the chairman and members of the conference committee for their inclusion of \$135 million for the Los Angeles Metrorail, contained in amendment 102.

For those of my colleagues who have traveled to Los Angeles, you are well aware of the extreme traffic congestion problems we currently face. These congestion problems are the main contributor to poor air quality in Los Angeles. Construction of the Los Angeles Metrorail represents the most effective means of reducing traffic gridlock and abiding by the Federal Clean Air Act. Despite local taxpayer approval of an increase in taxes for Metrorail construction, and despite State, local, and community leaders' strong support for the project, only by receiving Federal funding will extensive rail transit in Los Angeles become a reality.

Again, I thank Chairman LEHMAN, ranking member Congressman COUGHLIN, and the conferees for their particular attention to the needs of southern California. In addition, I invite my colleagues to come out to Los Angeles and

take a ride when the Metrorail system is complete.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH].

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this conference report and I commend the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and one ranking member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] for their hard work in fashioning a fair and balanced agreement with the other body.

I would especially like to compliment them for including language in the agreement which extends into fiscal year 1992 the authority of about 15 States, of which my State of Nevada is one, to set 65 miles-per-hour speed limits on certain four-lane, rural, noninterstate highways. As you know, the authority to set these higher speed limits expired on September 30, when the Federal Highway Administration ordered States to roll back the 65 miles-per-hour limit to 55 miles-per-hour or immediately lose Federal funds to start new highway projects. This was because of Congress' failure to continue the 1988 65 miles-per-hour demonstration project program.

Last week I joined with our minority leader, BOB MICHEL, in introducing H.R. 3474 which would authorize these programs. I am glad that this subcommittee has taken similar action and thank them for their help.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. CAMPBELL].

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to speak in support of the conference agreement on H.R. 2942, the fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations. I support the initiatives included in this legislation and look forward to its passage.

This legislation is particularly important while this body continues to deliberate over the future of our surface transportation infrastructure. We are positioned at a crucial juncture—the future of our transportation system, and the Nation's economy, literally rests in our hands.

I am particularly grateful about one provision in this bill that will provide \$10 million for the establishment of an ASR-9 radar at Walker Field Airport in Grand Junction, CO. Walker Field, the third busiest commercial airport in Colorado, had over 85,000 aircraft operations in 1990. As the largest airport between Denver and Salt Lake City, Walker Field is the backup airport for, and receives diverted aircraft from, over nine regional airports, including Denver's Stapleton and the Salt Lake City airport. The airport has experienced sustained growth of over 6 percent over the past several years.

Mr. Speaker, the Grand Junction ASR-9 radar system has been ranked

by the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] as the highest rated proposal in the Northwest Mountain region. The FAA has recommended funding for this proposal for many years but has never been able to obtain funding. The bill before us today corrects this oversight.

I wish to express my appreciation to Chairman LEHMAN, and the committee for its hard work. I look forward to the implementation of this proposal and urge my colleagues to support this carefully crafted bill.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LIGHTFOOT], a member of the committee.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2942, the Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriations for fiscal year 1992. I commend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] for putting together an excellent bill. As the newest member of the Appropriations Committee, I would also like to thank them, and their staff, for the courtesy they have extended me this year.

I would especially like to praise the subcommittee for including language in the bill prohibiting the Federal Aviation Administration from closing or reducing the hours of service of any flight service station until 9 months after submission to Congress of the Auxiliary Flight Service Station plan.

Until March of this year, I was a member of the House Aviation Subcommittee which approved the Auxiliary Flight Service Station program in last year's aviation reauthorization bill.

Since then I have been concerned by FAA attempts to delay implementation of the program and remarks by FAA officials who have referred to the program as "pork barrel politics." The FAA should be reminded Congress could have named the stations to remain open but chose to let the Nation's aviation experts, the FAA, decide which stations merited continued operation.

This is at last the fourth time in my congressional tenure that we have had to add language to a transportation-related bill instructing the FAA to keep flight service stations open. I find it unfortunate the only way we can get the FAA's attention on this issue is through the checkbook.

It is my hope that the FAA will stop the needless delay and do the job Congress mandated. Again, I commend Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. COUGHLIN for adding this language to the final bill. Their perseverance on this issue is deeply appreciated.

I urge my colleagues to support this conference report.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may

consume to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to congratulate the committee once again, both the chairman, my dear friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], my closest neighbor in Congress, and, of course, the minority for once again coming up with a package—that I think almost everybody in this body can support—and doing it in a way that brings credit to the institution and tries to answer the problems that exist out in the country to use the money in the programs and the capabilities that are concerned in this bill for making the country stronger, and better, and delivering the kind of services that the people of this country require.

I want to congratulate them. I think, once again, they have done an excellent job.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER].

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in strong support of the conference report and commends the distinguished gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], the chairman, and the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN], the ranking member, and all members of the subcommittee for their exceptionally fine work in bringing this important legislation to the House floor.

This appropriations conference report, I think, once again represents a significant and very much needed investment in the Nation's transportation system. It takes into account and reflects the overall needs of the Nation as well as addressing important and necessary regional transportation concerns.

Specifically this Member would like to express his profound appreciation to the subcommittee for recognizing the need for funding an authorized bridge between Niobrara, NE, and Springfield, SD, to replace an abandoned ferry.

This has been this Member's top appropriation priority for several years.

I also want to thank my colleague and neighbor, the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota, for his outstanding cooperative efforts with this Member in support of this bridge project, and commend my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT], for his support in this instance.

Second, this Member wishes to express his appreciation for the acceptance of the conference of the list and language found on pages 80 and 81 of the House conference report 102-516 which urges priority status for grant applications for airports in Nebraska City, NE, and York, NE.

□ 1430

This action would help insure quality air facilities for these communities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, this conference report addresses important current and future transportation needs of the United States. This Member supports and strongly urges his colleagues to support it, and I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SHAW].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the chairman, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN], and the ranking Republican member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] for the crafting of an excellent piece of legislation which is going to do much to further the transportation needs of this country.

I would particularly like also to thank the staff of the Appropriations Committee on the House side and all those who served on the conference committee, as well as the Transportation Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, for the fine work they have done.

I want to point out one part of this bill which I feel is extremely important. It is a project in my district of Fort Lauderdale, FL, 17th Street, which provides for a tunnel to go under the very busy intercoastal waterway. It will serve as a much needed reliever for the people of south Florida who use this roadway.

I particularly want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] for the amount of personal time that he spent on this particular project in my district. He invited into his office in Dade County, FL, a number of my constituents and let them lay their case out for the need for this project. This type of bipartisan cooperation between Members of Congress, which is all too rare today, is certainly refreshing, and I want to express my personal gratitude to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support and urge the passage of H.R. 2942, the conference report making appropriations for the Department of Transportation and related agencies for fiscal year 1992.

Although this conference report contains expenditures for many worthy programs and projects, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention one specific project of tremendous importance to the people of south Florida. The project I refer to is the 17th Street tunnel project in Fort Lauderdale, FL. This needed project has the support of the city of Fort Lauderdale, Broward County, and the State of Florida.

For the second year in a row, the Transportation appropriations conference report contains funds for this project. Last fiscal year, \$3.69 million was allocated; this fiscal year, the conference committee raised that appro-

priation to \$5.225 million. These needed funds will be used for continued environmental and other preliminary engineering studies, and for final purchase for the staging area.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the House Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee for shepherding such a fine bill through the legislative process. Ranking minority member, Mr. COUGHLIN, and the ranking majority member, Mr. CARR, did particularly fine jobs in trying to meet our Nation's tremendous transportation needs. However, the able chairman of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. LEHMAN, deserved special praise. As my colleagues are aware, my good friend and Florida colleague was ill earlier this year. Fortunately, through sheer grit and determination, BILL not only overcame his illness, he also produced a strong transportation appropriations bill. The people of south Florida, as well as the people of this Nation, are well served by Mr. LEHMAN's experience and expertise in transportation matters. I look forward to working with BILL on transportation issues next year, and also in the 103d Congress.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank my friend and neighbor, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH], and the gentleman from Fort Lauderdale, FL [Mr. SHAW], for their kind remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to my friend, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS].

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for the fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations conference agreement. I would like to commend the distinguished chairman, Congressman WILLIAM LEHMAN, the other members of the subcommittee, and the professional committee staff for their excellent work on this legislation.

Our strength as a nation depends on a safe and efficient public transportation system. And the bill provides critical funding to maintain and improve that system.

I would like to take a moment, Mr. Speaker, to highlight a few of the provisions which are of particular importance to my home State of Colorado.

First, this bill includes \$71.7 million for the new Denver International Airport. This marks the third year of Federal funding for the airport and the third year Congress has signaled its confidence in Colorado.

The new airport in Colorado is the only major airport start planned for the next decade. Located in the middle of the Nation, it will be the gateway to the West, as well as the channel for much of the Nation's East-West air traffic. While this airport will be built in Colorado, it will be used by citizens throughout the Nation and around the world. It will be a world class facility to lead the Nation's aviation system into the 21st century.

Second, the bill gives the I-70/I-25 interchange priority listing for I-4R discretionary funds. This major intersection in the Denver metro area, com-



monly called the "Mousetrap" because of its poor configuration, is severely congested and a bad hazard to motorists. Reconstruction of the interchange has national as well as local significance; both of these interstates are among the most heavily traveled north-south and east-west routes in the interior of the Nation. Unfortunately, I-25 is also a major national route for the transportation of hazardous materials. We can afford nothing less than top quality roadwork and design when it comes to shipping hazardous wastes through our communities. I am grateful my colleagues have recognized the urgency of this situation and have agreed to maintain its high priority for funding.

Third, the bill lists Denver's 23d Street viaduct as a priority recipient for funds from the Federal bridge discretionary fund. This critical route in and out of downtown Denver has been found to have a bridge sufficiency rating of 5, on a scale of 1 to 100. Clearly, repairing the viaduct is of vital importance, especially since it will serve the new stadium for the Colorado Rockies baseball team.

Finally, I am grateful that the committee approved my request to earmark funds for ASR-9 terminal radar at the airport in Grand Junction, CO. Walker Field was the highest rated airport in the Northwest Mountain Region for the installation of radar under FAA criteria. It is the third busiest airport in Colorado and the largest airport between Denver and Salt Lake City. As my colleagues recognize, the mountains present unique flying hazards that will be greatly reduced when this radar is installed. That is particularly important given Walker Field's significance as a regional reliever airport.

When we talk about transportation, we have got to stress that there is no such thing as a purely local transportation project. The Nation's infrastructure is a network of interconnected roads, bridges, airports, and highways. Our economic wellbeing—our trade and commerce—depends on it. And we all rely on a quality transportation system for our own personal convenience and safety. So, while these projects are critical to Colorado, they also benefit the whole Nation.

This bill takes important steps in the right direction. I urge my colleagues to support the conference report.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I continue to be concerned about the low level of the administration's request for appropriations for research and development at the Federal Aviation Administration. Therefore, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from Florida and the other conferees on both sides of the aisle for going above this request in certain crucial areas.

The Federal Aviation Administration has one of the biggest responsibilities of any Federal agency. Year in and year out, the FAA must

protect the safety of the flying public and provide flawless service. FAA's job is not getting any easier. Air traffic continues to increase even faster than the growth of our population. The Congress has an obligation to provide the dedicated civil servants at FAA with the technologies, equipment, and facilities they need to guarantee the traveling public the level of safety, efficiency, and reliability it rightfully expects.

Money, within limits, should be no object. The flying public has already paid for these improvements many times over. Over \$15 billion collected to improve our airways are sitting in the Federal aviation trust fund gathering interest and dust.

Assuring safe and reliable air traffic control under all weather conditions requires the application of advanced technologies. New equipment is necessary to integrate air traffic control with space-based systems such as the global positioning satellites. We need other improvements to benefit the air traveler starting with his entry through more accurate explosives detectors, his passage in more precisely inspected aircraft, and his arrival by means of safer landing systems.

The additional appropriation of \$15 million that the conferees have provided is an important step toward increased air safety. The \$8 million appropriation for satellite application research is particularly welcomed. However, many important research needs including the Descent Advisor Program, which is particularly useful in adverse weather conditions, did not make the final version.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the conferees, whom I expect share my view that more can and should be done. I am optimistic that fiscal year 1993 will be a better year. Therefore, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee and in the administration next year in a joint effort to bring aviation research to an even higher level.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment and thank the conferees who worked so diligently to complete the Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992 and for including my amendment to clarify that the Drivers' License Suspension Program we enacted last year will be carried out without interruption.

As you know this program requires States to suspend the drivers' license of any individual convicted of a drug offense. It's a program that has had great results in New Jersey and Oregon, and I am looking forward to its implementation across the entire United States.

Let me also emphasize that the States have 1 year left to put this law into effect or they will lose 5 percent of their Federal highway funds. I would urge those State legislatures and Governors who have not passed the appropriate enacting legislation to do so because I can assure you the U.S. Congress is not going to extend the compliance deadline on this important drug prevention law.

Once again, I would like to thank the conferees for their support of my amendment and for all their hard work.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to express my strong support for the conference agreement on the fiscal year 1992 transportation appropriations bill. I commend my colleague, Chairman WILLIAM LEHMAN, for

his hard work and dedication in putting forth a strong appropriations bill that will go a long way in providing funds to support, expand, and improve our Nation's infrastructure. Additionally, I think it is important to stress that this agreement is within the targets set by last year's historical deficit reduction package.

I am particularly pleased that funds have been provided for the continued construction of the Santa Fe Bypass in New Mexico. The completion of the Santa Fe Bypass is vitally important to the health and safety of Santa Fe's residents as it is needed for the safe transportation of radioactive material that will soon be stored at the waste isolation pilot plant [WIPP] in Carlsbad, NM. The bypass would provide an alternate route for the many trucks that will be transporting radioactive waste from all over the Nation to WIPP. If the bypass is not completed by the opening of WIPP, radioactive wastes will be transported through the heart of Santa Fe, the State's second largest city with a population of nearly 56,000.

This and other provisions included in this agreement provide much needed improvements to New Mexico's roads, highways, and airports. Mr. Speaker, this legislation is critical for the residents of my district and the State of New Mexico. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report to accompany H.R. 2942, the transportation and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1991. This is the ninth conference report on 1 of the 13 annual appropriations bills to be reported to the House.

This conference report provides \$13.782 billion in total discretionary budget authority and \$31.793 billion in total discretionary outlays, which is \$3 million below the 602(b) subdivision for budget authority and \$7 million below the 602(b) subdivision for outlays, respectively, for this subcommittee.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I will continue to inform the House of the impact of all spending legislation. I have provided a "Dear Colleague" letter describing how each appropriations measure considered so far compared to the 602(b) subdivisions for that subcommittee. I will provide similar information about the remaining conference agreements on the fiscal year 1991 appropriations bills.

I look forward to working with the Appropriations Committee in the future and commend the committee for the work they have done in adhering to the limits set forth in the budget agreement and the 1992 budget resolution.

COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,  
Washington, DC, October 8, 1991.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Attached is a fact sheet on the conference report to accompany H.R. 2942, the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 1991. This conference report could be considered at any time.

This is the ninth conference report of the regular fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill to be reported to the House. The bill is \$3 million below the discretionary budget authority 602(b) spending subdivision and \$7 million below the outlay subdivision.

I hope this information will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,  
Chairman.

## [Fact sheet]

CONFERENCE REPORT TO ACCOMPANY H.R. 2942, DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1992 (H. REPT. 102-243)

The House Appropriations Committee filed the conference report for the Department of

Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Bill for Fiscal Year 1992 on Monday, October 7, 1991. This conference report could be considered on the floor at any time.

## COMPARISON TO THE 602(b) SUBDIVISION

The conference report provides \$13,762 million of discretionary budget authority, \$3

million less than the appropriations subdivision for this subcommittee. The bill is \$7 million below the subdivision total for estimated discretionary outlays. A comparison of the bill with the funding subdivision follows:

## COMPARISON TO DOMESTIC SPENDING ALLOCATION

[In millions of dollars]

	Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill		Appropriations Committee 302(b) subdivision		Bill over(+)/under(-) committee 302(b) subdivision	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Discretionary	13,762	31,793	13,765	31,800	-3	-7
Mandatory <sup>1</sup>	537	540	537	540		
Total	14,299	32,333	14,302	32,340	-3	-7

<sup>1</sup> Conforms to the Budget Resolution estimates for existing law.

Note.—BA—New budget authority; O—Estimated outlays.

The House Appropriations Committee reported the Committee's subdivision of budget authority and outlays in House Report 102-180. These subdivisions are consistent with the allocation of spending responsibility to accompany H. Con. Res. 121, Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992, as adopted by the Congress on May 22, 1991.

## PROGRAM HIGHLIGHTS

Following are major program highlights for the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations conference report for Fiscal Year 1992:

[In millions of dollars]

Department of Transportation	Budget authority	New outlays
Coast Guard operations	2,320	1,856
Coast Guard acquisition, construction and improvement	390	43
Federal Aviation Administration:		
Operations	4,360	3,837
Facilities and equipment	2,394	479
Research and engineering	218	131
Airport improvement programs (obligation ceiling)	(1,900)	304
Amtrak	651	581
Northeast Corridor Improvement Program	205	41
Urban Mass Transportation Administration:		
Formula grants	1,520	517
Interstate transfer grants	160	3
Washington Metro	124	2
Discretionary grants (Obligation ceiling)	(1,900)	49
Federal-aid highways (Obligation ceiling)	(16,800)	3,036

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2942, the Transportation appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992.

While balancing many competing demands for finite resources, the committee has done a good job of producing a bill that provides the necessary funding for an effective national transportation system. It is a bill that attacks congestion in urban communities by expanding the capacity of our Nation's highway network while at the same time encouraging the use of mass transportation. It is obvious that in some gridlocked communities across the country, even with unlimited funds, we could never lay enough pavement to accommodate all of the vehicles. Therefore, we must continue to try to provide commuters the option of mass transit. This bill focuses on both components of the solution to traffic gridlock—upgraded roadways and mass transit.

This bill also takes the foresighted approach of stimulating the search for creative new ap-

proaches to our transportation problems by providing funding for intelligent vehicle and highway system [IVHS] research across the country. In the Washington area just last week with the fatal truck-related crash on the Wilson Bridge, we had a tragic reminder of the critical need for new efficient technological solutions to traffic congestion.

I would like to commend Mr. LEHMAN and Mr. COUGHLIN and all the members of the conference committee for their tireless work and spirit of compromise in arriving at a balanced bill that addresses our critical transportation needs. Also, I applaud the yeoman's work of the staff in this challenging effort.

Again, my congratulations to the chairman on completing this task against some difficult challenges, and I would urge the support of my colleagues of the conference report on H.R. 2942.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report for H.R. 2942, the Department of Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1992.

As a new member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, I have been very appreciative of the help and courtesy Chairman LEHMAN has extended to me this year. He is an outstanding chairman, and I have enjoyed working with him.

I have also enjoyed working with the other members of the subcommittee. In particular, I want to thank LARRY COUGHLIN, the ranking Republican member of this subcommittee, for his help.

I also want to thank the staff of this committee. Tom Kingfield, Rich Efford, Linda Muir, and Zee Latif, as well as Lucy Hand of Mr. LEHMAN's personal staff, work extremely hard to ensure that the agencies thoroughly justify their requests and to make certain that every dollar is effectively utilized. This subcommittee has also led the way in pressing procurement reform in the Department of Transportation, especially the Coast Guard and the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA].

Maintaining and enhancing our transportation infrastructure is critical if our Nation is to remain economically competitive. This bill, by supporting efforts to upgrade airports, highways, and public transportation, is a critical investment in our Nation's economic future. The bill also funds a robust research program, to make certain that we remain competitive with

nations like Japan and the European Community that are making large investments in highway technology and research.

Without this bill, the quality of life in this country would suffer as people faced delays in the air and on the ground. Without this bill, our environment would suffer because we would be unable to make the transportation decisions necessary to ensure clean air. This bill responds specifically to the needs of large urban areas and interurban areas like the research triangle area of North Carolina which are growing rapidly and face the challenge of minimizing traffic congestion, meeting clean air standards, and planning intelligently for the future.

Safety is also a chief concern of this subcommittee, and we have taken steps to make certain that travel, whether by car, rail, or air, is made safer. Research on important safety questions as well as enhanced facilities and equipment will help protect every American who is traveling in this country.

In closing, I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is a well-crafted and responsible bill and deserving of every member's support.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2942, the Transportation Appropriations Act of Fiscal Year 1992. This bill provides badly needed funding for a number of programs and agencies which are extremely important to southern New Jersey, including the FAA Technical Center and the U.S. Coast Guard Training Center.

At the same time, it includes the legislation which my colleague LARRY COUGHLIN and I introduced last month, H.R. 3361—to require drug and alcohol testing of transportation workers. Our bill was identical to the measure sponsored by Senators ERNEST HOLLINGS and JOHN DANFORTH, and I am very pleased that it has been made a part of the conference report on the Transportation appropriation bill.

This marks the first time that the House has approved the drug and alcohol testing language since it was first proposed in 1987. Clearly, this is a major victory for the traveling public.

The operators of airplanes, trains, buses, and other public vehicles have a responsibility to do their jobs free of alcohol and drugs. Unfortunately, this has not always been the case in recent years.

In January 1987, 16 people died and 170 were injured when a Conrail freight train ran



through warning signals and slammed into an Amtrak passenger train in Chase, MD. Both the engineer and brakeman of the Conrail train later admitted that they were smoking marijuana at the time of the accident.

Last year, three pilots from Northwest Airline were fired after they flew a jetliner with 90 passengers on board while intoxicated.

And just this summer 5 people died and 130 were injured in a New York City subway crash caused by a driver who had a blood-alcohol content of more than twice the legal limit some 13 hours after the accident.

The U.S. Department of Transportation has attempted to address this problem by issuing regulations which require the testing of nearly 4 million transportation workers for drugs. While I commend the DOT for its efforts, their rules simply do not go far enough. We need to include alcohol testing as part of this program, and just as importantly, Congress must put the force of law behind these regulations to avoid court challenges.

The legislation which Representative COUGHLIN and I introduced, and which is a part of this conference report, will require the Secretary of Transportation to establish a comprehensive program of drug and alcohol testing for transportation employees who hold safety-sensitive positions. This would include preemployment, reasonable suspicion, random, recurring, and postaccident testing.

The specific testing procedures mandated under our bill would incorporate guidelines established by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to assure the accuracy of the tests, as well as protections for the individuals' privacy and confidentiality of the results.

It would also require the development of rehabilitation programs for employees who are found to have used drugs or alcohol.

I realize that a drug and alcohol testing program of this magnitude will be expensive, and is not without inconvenience or sacrifice for those that are tested. Nevertheless, I believe the initiative is carefully drawn and balanced and necessary under the circumstances.

Innocent travelers have a right to know that the operators of the vehicles they are riding in are not under the influence of drugs and alcohol and are able and prepared to perform their jobs with skill and professionalism. This testing program will provide an extra measure of security for the many passengers who place their lives in the hands of commercial transportation operators each day.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the members of the committee for putting forth a Transportation appropriations bill that truly represents a commitment of the Congress to improving this Nation's infrastructure, and leading the business of moving people, goods, and services toward the 21st century.

I am most pleased to see that in its deliberations, the committee has chosen to fund many vitally needed transportation projects, some of which are immediate concerns, and others that will allow for improved and more efficient transportation systems in the years to come. In my own State of New Jersey, the most densely populated State in the Nation, this bill brings real solutions to growing problems.

To address immediate concerns of traffic congestion, efficiency, and safety, H.R. 2942 allocates \$4 million to find alternatives to a treacherous and crowded interchange at Routes 4 and 17, one of the busiest of my district's commercial centers. The hazards of the interchange produce a serious safety factor. To improve long-term mass transit across the northern New Jersey region \$70 million is devoted to seeing that the urban core project becomes reality. This project, a textbook example of intermodality, will see improved links between Newark Airport, the Port of Elizabeth, Penn Station and the Hudson Waterfront Transportation system.

To assure that our highways are the most efficient they can be, \$1 million is devoted to the New Jersey Institute of Technology to research transportation of the future, intelligent vehicle-highway systems.

I am perhaps most pleased, however, with the conference committee's decision to provide more than \$6 million to New Jersey Transit to continue its work in putting passengers on the New York Susquehanna Western Railway. This line, first put in use over a century ago, is seeing a much deserved renaissance. My colleagues may be interested to know that in the last 5 years, the once-dormant tracks have once again seen utilization for freight lining across northern and western New Jersey.

It is now time to move forward again and put passengers on the Great Susquehanna. I am pleased to have worked in recent years with State and local officials, and the Urban Mass Transit Authority, to study the feasibility of expansion. We are now moving forward with a timetable for action. When this project is complete, the new New York Susquehanna Eastern Railway will bring accessible, fuel efficient, and environment-friendly mass transportation to countless new riders, and tie regions of Bergen, Passaic, Sussex and Morris Counties to the transportation hubs of northern New Jersey. This in turn will relieve massive congestion on overburdened highways across northern New Jersey, speed commutes, and reduce the environmental impact of increased automobile emissions.

As the Nation takes up its responsibilities under the Clean Air Act of meeting both transportation and environmental concerns, there is no better time than the present for the New York Susquehanna Western Railway to come back on line. With this funding, the committee has given northern New Jersey commuters the signal to get on the fast track.

I once again offer my congratulations to the Committees on Appropriations in both Chambers for their fine work with this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this conference report on the fiscal year 1992 Transportation and related agencies appropriations bill (H.R. 2942).

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the conference report on H.R. 2942, the fiscal year 1992 Transportation appropriations bill.

I want to express my appreciation to the chairman, Mr. LEHMAN, and the ranking member, Mr. COUGHLIN, for their excellent work in assembling this measure and guiding it through the conference. We all know these are difficult fiscal times, but what is sometimes not recognized is the increasing pressure that

the Appropriations Committee chairmen members, and their staffs come under as a result of tight budgets. Their ability to make difficult decisions and ensure the effective use of increasingly scarce funds is more important than ever.

Just as vital is their sensitivity to pressing local needs. The city of Mount Vernon is poised to move forward with an economic revitalization program which will seek to capitalize on its position in the region's transportation grid. The conference report contains funding for preparatory work on an intermodal parking facility which is crucial to launching the entire revitalization effort. This vital Federal support will provide momentum that will attract private investment to the Mount Vernon project that is sorely needed in our urban communities.

Transportation holds the key to opening up economic opportunities to the citizens of this community. I want to congratulate the chairman and the members of the committee for recognizing this project's potential as an engine of growth in Mount Vernon.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker, today, as the House considers the Transportation appropriation conference report, I would like to highlight an important project included in the report which will greatly benefit students and scholars of aviation and aerospace technology.

All Long Islanders are proud of our history as the cradle of modern aviation. With major airports and a rich diversity of high-technology industries already in place, Long Island is uniquely prepared to continue this tradition of excellence in the advancement of aeronautical sciences.

An important element in maintaining our competitiveness in this field is the proposal by Dowling College in Oakdale, Long Island, to build a National Aviation and Transportation Center at Brookhaven Airport. This center will allow Dowling to expand its aeronautical education programs, which began in 1968, to meet the growing need for trained personnel in the aviation field.

At the same time, a National Aviation Center will provide an opportunity to retrain Long Island's labor force as our economy continues to diversify. It will also help to encourage young people to stay on Long Island by providing both educational and career opportunities.

The National Aviation Center, which will include a Challenger Learning Center and an FAA Aviation Education Center, will be built with Federal and private dollars. I am pleased that \$3 million in startup money was included for this most worthwhile project.

The Dowling College National Aviation and Transportation Center will be both a reminder of Long Island's past aviation heritage and a symbol of its future potential in the field of aeronautical science.

Ms. MOLINARI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report and I applaud the conferees for their work on this legislation.

The conference report addresses two recent catastrophes in New York City: the subway tragedy that left 5 people dead and over 130 injured, and the ferry terminal fire that continues to inconvenience thousands of commuters. Both events have reeked havoc on the city's transportation infrastructure and caused mass transit riders to fear for their safety on their way to work.

The conference agreement directs the Transportation Department to establish comprehensive drug and alcohol testing programs for all safety-sensitive transportation workers. As you may know, Mr. Speaker, the conductor of the subway train involved in this disaster is believed to have been under the influence of alcohol at the time of the incident. While the Department of Transportation already requires such testing for safety-sensitive employees in the aviation, railroad, and interstate bus industries, Federal courts have previously exempted mass transit workers from random testing. By extending random drug and alcohol testing to mass transit workers in safety-sensitive positions, we will restore public confidence in public transportation.

The September 8 fire at the Staten Island Ferry terminal in Manhattan has made the commute for 40,000 of my constituents a daily nightmare. For Staten Island residents, the ferry is not a luxury or a tourist attraction. For thousands of Staten Islanders the ferry is a vital link to their jobs in Manhattan. The conference report acknowledges the magnitude of this disaster and establishes the rebuilding of the ferry terminal as a priority project.

On behalf of the 40,000 daily Staten Island ferry commuters and mass transit riders across the country, I thank the chairman and the ranking Republican members for including these provisions.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, today we are voting on a matter of utmost importance to the thousands of commuters who traverse Lake Washington on a daily basis.

Included in this year's Transportation appropriations is \$90 million to pay for construction of the I-90 bridge. I worked hard with my friend and colleague, Senator SLADE GORTON, to have the funds for this project included in this year's bill.

I would like to also thank my colleagues on the conference committee—especially Congressman LARRY COUGHLIN—for helping us present our arguments on this matter. The State of Washington is grateful for your assistance and attention to our important transportation needs.

There's another group of people who are thankful for the committee's action—the thousands of commuters who struggle daily with bumper-to-bumper traffic congestion because of the bridge's sinking last fall.

Every day, thousands of Washingtonians are frustrated by the lack of adequate passage over Lake Washington. Solving their frustrations has been one of my top legislative priorities.

Last year, we appeared close to a solution with the construction of the I-90 bridge. That was before last fall's Arctic Express rocked the Pacific Northwest with howling winds and torrential downpours. In fact, so much rain fell that the bridge sunk.

A lawsuit between the contractor and the State of Washington to decide who is at fault for the bridge's sinking could be tied up in the courts for years. But, with passage of today's bill, the court action becomes a secondary issue to the immediate transportation needs of Washingtonians.

And that's certainly good news, Mr. Speaker. I urge my colleagues to support the 1992 Transportation appropriations.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the conference report for H.R. 2942, Transportation appropriations for fiscal year 1992. I commend Chairman WHITTEN of the full committee and thank Chairman LEHMAN, Mr. COUGHLIN, and the subcommittee staff for their efforts in putting together this important piece of legislation.

Under the leadership of Chairman LEHMAN, the subcommittee has produced a bill that will provide funding necessary to meet the transportation infrastructure needs of the country. The projects funded in this conference report touch all Americans. The conference report affects the bus or train service they use to get to work, the roads they drive on, the bridges they cross. The transit development funds contained in this conference report are critical for reducing our dependence on fossil fuels and for increasing the quality of the air we breathe.

The conference report includes funding for transportation projects that are important to my district of San Francisco and to the entire San Francisco Bay Area. The committee has earmarked \$55 million for key transit expansions in the Bay Area. These extensions are critical elements in the Bay Area's long-term transportation strategy which has been crafted so carefully by local and country governments.

The committee has also included report language directing the Urban Mass Transportation Administration [UMTA] to give priority consideration to a San Francisco municipal railway turnback project that is essential to efforts to revitalize San Francisco's waterfront. Thanks to this committee, construction of the new parkway and light rail system on San Francisco's Historic Waterfront will begin October 28.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to state that the San Francisco Area has achieved one of the highest levels of local share in the country—70 percent. Clearly, San Franciscans understand that a comprehensive transit system is important for the economic and environmental health of their area and they are willing to provide a large share of the funds that are necessary to build it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2942 is an extremely important piece of legislation. I appreciate the leadership of Chairman LEHMAN and Congressman COUGHLIN in bringing this conference report to the floor and I urge my colleagues to vote for it.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 2942, to appropriate funds for the Department of Transportation.

Significant among the agencies in the Department of Transportation is the U.S. Coast Guard. It is ironic that the one agency that must be prepared to respond to a long list of emergency situations in the performance of its duties as the guardian of our shores and inland waters, is the one agency that perennially faces a crisis in its funding.

This year I am most concerned about the level of funding for the acquisition, construction, and improvements account. The approved level is \$37 million, less than the President's request for fiscal year 1992. It may be possible for the Coast Guard to adapt to this reduction for 1 year, but we must make certain that this account is adequately funded in fiscal

year 1993. Several major acquisition projects that are critical to the Coast Guard's ability to meet the demands of its many missions could be crippled unless the funds are restored in the coming budget.

The demands of Desert Storm/Desert Shield once again proved the versatility and dependability of the Coast Guard Reserves. This very capability is the reason I, and my colleagues on the Armed Services Committee, have repeatedly supported the recommendation of the Secretary of Transportation to incrementally increase the selected Reserve to reach the level of strength currently experienced by the other services. This recommended strength is 95 percent of its wartime mobilization requirements, of which the Coast Guard currently has less than half. The Coast Guard's active duty forces cannot alone guarantee the security of U.S. ports during a national emergency.

Not only have the Reserve forces consistently demonstrated their value during emergencies, but they have been integrated into the daily operations of the Coast Guard. Their efforts capably supplement the regular Coast Guard, freeing up vital resources and maintaining the ability to step into position no matter what demands are placed upon them. Whether it is to respond to a national wartime emergency, or another disastrous oil spill, we must make certain the effort to sustain and increase the Coast Guard selected Reserve continues.

I am pleased to see in this conference report the transfer of the Coast Guard's land based aerostats, sea based aerostats, and E-2C aircraft to the Department of Defense. Vital as these resources are to the drug interdiction effort, their operation and maintenance are best supported within the Air Force and Navy.

I am especially pleased to see the appropriation of \$1 million for the engineering and design work for the renovation of the USCG Cutter *Mackinaw*. As the flagship of the Great Lakes icebreaking fleet, it is the only icebreaker capable of extended, uninterrupted icebreaking during severe winters. When a call for help comes from one of the large Great Lakes vessels that has become stranded during the winter gales that are common to the region, it is the *Mack* that must respond.

Time and again, the *Mackinaw* has proven her worth by unfailingly keeping major shipping channels open when all other vessels were found to be ineffective. Built in 1943, no comparable replacement icebreaker has been planned by the Coast Guard in the near future. This \$1 million is the first major step in the renovation that will keep the *Mackinaw* operating for another 15 years, while permitting a reduction in crew and a greater conservation of operating expenses. I feel the continued operation of the USCG *Mackinaw* is critical to shipping on the Great Lakes and strongly support this appropriation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the conference report.



There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the conference report.

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 374, nays 49, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 299]

YEAS—374

Abercrombie	DeLay	Horn
Ackerman	Dellums	Horton
Alexander	Derrick	Houghton
Allard	Dickinson	Hoyer
Anderson	Dingell	Hubbard
Andrews (ME)	Dixon	Huckaby
Andrews (NJ)	Donnelly	Hughes
Andrews (TX)	Dooley	Hunter
Annuizio	Dornan (CA)	Hutto
Anthony	Downey	Hyde
Applegate	Durbin	Inhofe
Aspin	Dwyer	Ireland
Atkins	Early	Jefferson
AuCoin	Eckart	Jenkins
Bacchus	Edwards (CA)	Johnson (CT)
Baker	Edwards (OK)	Johnson (SD)
Barrett	Edwards (TX)	Johnson (TX)
Bateman	Emerson	Johnston
Bellenson	Engel	Jones (GA)
Bennett	English	Jones (NC)
Bentley	Erdreich	Jontz
Bereuter	Espy	Kanjorski
Berman	Evans	Kaptur
Beverly	Ewing	Kasich
Billbray	Fascell	Kennedy
Billirakis	Fazio	Kennelly
Billiey	Feighan	Kildee
Boehlert	Fields	Kleczka
Bonior	Fish	Klug
Borski	Flake	Kolbe
Boucher	Foglietta	Kolter
Boxer	Ford (MI)	Kopetski
Brewster	Ford (TN)	Kostmayer
Brooks	Frank (MA)	LaFalce
Broomfield	Frost	Lagomarsino
Browder	Gallagher	Lancaster
Brown	Gallo	Lantos
Bryant	Gaydos	LaRocco
Bustamante	Gedenson	Laughlin
Byron	Gephardt	Leach
Callahan	Geren	Lehman (CA)
Camp	Gibbons	Lehman (FL)
Campbell (CO)	Gilchrest	Lent
Cardin	Gillmor	Levin (MI)
Carper	Gilman	Levine (CA)
Carr	Glickman	Lewis (CA)
Chandler	Gonzalez	Lewis (FL)
Chapman	Goodling	Lewis (GA)
Clay	Gordon	Lightfoot
Clement	Gradison	Lipinski
Clinger	Grandy	Livingston
Coleman (MO)	Green	Lloyd
Coleman (TX)	Guarini	Long
Collins (MI)	Gunderson	Lowery (CA)
Condit	Hall (OH)	Lowery (NY)
Conyers	Hall (TX)	Machtley
Cooper	Hamilton	Manton
Costello	Hammerschmidt	Markey
Coughlin	Hansen	Marlenee
Cox (CA)	Harris	Martin
Cox (IL)	Hatcher	Martinez
Coyne	Hayes (IL)	Matsui
Cramer	Hayes (LA)	Mavroules
Cunningham	Hefner	Mazzoli
Darden	Henry	McCloskey
Davis	Hertel	McCollum
de la Garza	Hoagland	McCrery
DeFazio	Hobson	McCurdy
DeLauro	Hochbrueckner	McDade

McDermott	Porter	Smith (NJ)
McGrath	Poshard	Smith (OR)
McHugh	Price	Smith (TX)
McMillan (NC)	Pursell	Snowe
McMillen (MD)	Quillen	Solarz
McNulty	Rahall	Spence
Meyers	Ramstad	Spratt
Mfume	Rangel	Staggers
Michel	Ravenel	Stallings
Miller (CA)	Ray	Stark
Miller (OH)	Reed	Stenholm
Miller (WA)	Regula	Stokes
Mineta	Richardson	Studds
Mink	Ridge	Sundquist
Moakley	Riggs	Swett
Molinaro	Rinaldo	Swift
Mollohan	Ritter	Synar
Mrazek	Roe	Tallon
Montgomery	Roemer	Tanner
Moorhead	Rogers	Tauzin
Moran	Ros-Lehtinen	Taylor (MS)
Morella	Rose	Thomas (CA)
Morrison	Rostenkowski	Thomas (GA)
Murphy	Roth	Thornton
Murtha	Roukema	Torres
Myers	Rowland	Torricelli
Nagle	Roybal	Traficant
Natcher	Russo	Traxler
Neal (MA)	Sabo	Unsoeld
Neal (NC)	Sanders	Upton
Nichols	Sangmeister	Valentine
Nowak	Santorum	Vander Jagt
Oaker	Sarpalius	Vento
Oberstar	Savage	Visclosky
Obey	Sawyer	Volkmer
Olin	Saxton	Vucanovich
Oliver	Schaefer	Walsh
Ortiz	Scheuer	Waters
Orton	Schiff	Waxman
Owens (NY)	Schroeder	Weber
Owens (UT)	Schulze	Weiss
Oxley	Schumer	Weldon
Packard	Serrano	Wheat
Panetta	Sharp	Whitten
Parker	Shaw	Williams
Pastor	Shuster	Wilson
Patterson	Sikorski	Wise
Paxon	Sisisky	Wolf
Payne (NJ)	Skaggs	Wolpe
Payne (VA)	Skeen	Wyden
Pelosi	Skelton	Wyllie
Perkins	Slattery	Yates
Peterson (FL)	Slaughter (NY)	Yatron
Peterson (MN)	Slaughter (VA)	Young (AK)
Pickett	Smith (FL)	Young (FL)
Pickle	Smith (IA)	

NAYS—49

Archer	Fawell	Penny
Armey	Franks (CT)	Petri
Ballenger	Gekas	Rhodes
Barton	Goss	Roberts
Boehner	Hancock	Rohrabacher
Bruce	Hastert	Sensenbrenner
Bunning	Hefley	Shays
Burton	Herger	Solomon
Campbell (CA)	Jacobs	Stearns
Coble	James	Stump
Combest	Kyl	Taylor (NC)
Crane	Luken	Thomas (WY)
Dannemeyer	McEwen	Walker
Doolittle	Moody	Zeliff
Dorgan (ND)	Nussle	Zimmer
Dreier	Pallone	
Duncan	Pease	

NOT VOTING—10

Barnard	Gingrich	Towns
Collins (IL)	Holloway	Washington
Dicks	Hopkins	
Dymally	McCandless	

□ 1454

Messrs. FRANKS of Connecticut, ROHRBACHER, ROBERTS, RHODES, PETRI, and HERGER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. NAGLE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE LOUIS STOKES, CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable LOUIS STOKES, chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS  
OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,  
Washington, DC, October 8, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have given careful thought to the investigation referred to the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct under House Resolution 236. I am appreciative of the confidence expressed in this Committee by the House leadership and House members.

An investigation of a serious matter of this sort must be conducted thoroughly and without any appearance of impropriety.

I have admitted that on occasions I was called by the Sergeant at Arms Office and advised that my account was overdrawn, and that on these occasions I made the appropriate deposits.

While I have done nothing violative of House Rules or ethics and I feel that I could be fair and impartial, in order to avert any appearance of impropriety, I deem it in the best interests of the Committee and the House that I not participate in this investigation. Accordingly, I am removing myself from any participation in this particular investigation.

Sincerely,

LOUIS STOKES,  
Chairman.

# APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT DURING PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 236

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 4(e)(2)(D) of rule X, the Chair appoints the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME] to act as a member of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct during the pendency of any committee proceeding pursuant to House Resolution 236.

# REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1330

Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from the bill, H.R. 1330.

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

There was no objection.

# DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1992

## AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Tuesday, October 8, 1991, the amendments in disagreement are considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate the first amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 7: Page 6, line 2, strike out all after "1992" down to and including "service" in line 5.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for service to communities not receiving such service during fiscal year 1991, unless such communities are otherwise eligible for new service, provide the required local match and are no more than 200 miles from a large hub airport: *Provided further*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available to increase the service levels to communities receiving service unless the Secretary of Transportation certifies in writing that such increased service levels are estimated to result in self-sufficiency within three years of initiation of the increased level of service".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 7, line 12, after "appropriation" insert "*Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the operation, maintenance or manning of LORAN-C radio-navigation transmitters outside the boundaries of the United States, land-based and sea-based aerostationary balloons, or E2C aircraft".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this Act shall be available for the operation, maintenance or manning of land-based and sea-based aerostationary balloons, or E2C aircraft".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 24, 29, 31, 32, 85, 92, 113, 156, 158, 159, 160, and 161 be considered en bloc and printed in the RECORD.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object I just want to make sure that certain amendments were not included in the en bloc request I just want to make sure that amendments numbered 64, 67, 68, and 72 were not in the en bloc request.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. They are not involved, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The texts of the various Senate amendments referred to in the unanimous-consent request are as follows:

Senate Amendment No. 24: Page 11, line 7, after "aircraft," insert "reimbursement at the discretion of the Administrator for travel, transportation, and subsistence expenses for the training of non-Federal domestic and foreign personnel whose services will contribute significantly to carrying out air transportation security programs under section 316(c) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended,".

Senate Amendment No. 29: Page 13, line 25, after "the" insert "construction,".

Senate Amendment No. 31: Page 14, line 18, after "centum" insert "*Provided further*, That a stand alone directional finder FAA-5530 receiver indicator system is to be installed at the Salisbury, Maryland airport flight service station within 180 days of enactment of this Act".

Senate Amendment No. 32: Page 14, line 18, after "centum" insert "*Provided further*,

That funds appropriated under this heading for this or prior years are available for the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into a sole source procurement with the Regional Airport Authority of Louisville-Jefferson County, Kentucky to design and construct an air traffic control tower at Stanford Field, using current Federal Aviation Administration control tower specifications".

Senate Amendment No. 85: Page 31, line 2, after "Lifesaver" insert "*Provided further*, That \$150,000 is available until expended to support by financial assistance agreement railroad metallurgical and welding studies at the Oregon Graduate Institute."

Senate Amendment No. 92: Page 32, line 15, after "thereafter" insert "*Provided further*, That none of the funds provided in this or any other Act shall be made available to finance the acquisition and rehabilitation of a line, and construction necessary to facilitate improved rail passenger service, between Spuyten Duyvil, New York, and the main line of the Northeast Corridor unless the Secretary of Transportation certifies that not less than 40 per centum of the costs of such improvements shall be derived from non-Amtrak sources."

Senate Amendment No. 113: Page 38, after line 22, insert:

## AVIATION INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

For expense necessary to discharge the functions of Aviation Information Management, \$2,495,000: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, for reports publication and dissemination, and for aviation information management: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, there may be credited to this appropriation up to \$1,000,000 in funds received from user fees established to support the electronic tariff filing system.

Senate Amendment No. 156: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 350. Unobligated funds in the amount of \$170,000 authorized and appropriated under Public Law 101-516 for a highway grade crossing demonstration project in White River Junction, Vermont shall be made available to the State of Vermont Agency of Transportation without regard to whether or not such expenses are incurred in accordance with section 106 of title 23 of the United States Code.

Senate Amendment No. 158: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 352. TELECOMMUTING STUDY.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy, shall conduct a study of the potential costs and benefits to the energy and transportation sectors of telecommuting. The study shall include—

- (1) an estimation of the amount and type of reduction of commuting by form of transportation type and numbers of commuters;
- (2) an estimation of the potential number of lives saved;
- (3) an estimation of the reduction in environmental pollution, in consultation with the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (4) an estimation of the amount and type of reduction of energy use and savings by form of transportation type; and
- (5) an estimation of the social impact of widespread use of telecommuting.

(b) This study shall be completed no more than one hundred and eighty days after the date of enactment of this Act. A report, summarizing the results of the study, shall be transmitted to the United States House of



Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate no more than sixty days after completion of this study.

Senate Amendment No. 159: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 353. Notwithstanding section 127 of title 23, United States Code, the State of Wyoming may permit the use of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways located in Wyoming by vehicles in excess of 80,000 pounds gross weight, but meeting axle and bridge formula specifications in section 127 of title 23, United States Code, until June 30, 1992.

Senate Amendment No. 160: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 354. (a) In light of recent positive changes in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Congress finds that the Secretary of Defense and the Commandant of the Coast Guard should reexamine policies of the United States regarding the restricted use of certain ports of entry by ships, and crew members thereof, of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, including commercial cargo, passenger, fishing and fisheries support vessels. The Secretary of Defense and the Commandant of the Coast Guard shall jointly report back to Congress within 30 days following the date of the enactment of this Act regarding their examination of such policies, together with their recommendations.

(b) For purposes of this section, the term "ships" means ships owned by, under the flag of, or operated by crew members of, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Senate amendment No. 161: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 355. For purposes of the Act of June 30, 1982 (96 Stat. 150), giving the consent of Congress to a compact relating to the establishment of a commission to study the feasibility of rapid rail transit service between certain States; the Congress authorizes the parties to such compact to change the name of such compact, including the name or names of any commission or other entity thereunder.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 24, 29, 31, 32, 85, 92, 113, 156, 158, 159, 160, and 161, and concur therein.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida?

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 28: Page 12, line 24, strike out all after "Fund," over to and including "activities," in line 12 on page 13 and insert "\$2,557,807,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert

"\$2,394,000,000, including \$2,244,052,000 to remain available until September 30, 1994, and including \$149,948,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 64: Page 27, line 1, strike out all after "development" down to and including "project" in line 4 and insert "\$168,050,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken and inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "249,146,000, together with \$4,628,000 to be derived by transfer from the 'Nuclear Waste Transportation Safety Demonstration project'".

□ 1500

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I seek time to debate the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The Chair will inquire, is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] opposed to the motion?

Mr. COUGHLIN. No, I am not opposed to the motion, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, there are basically several categories of highway demonstration projects in this bill:

First, some of the projects are authorized and have been funded in previous years.

Second, most of the others are continuations of projects started in previous years.

Third, the remaining projects involve feasibility studies, preliminary engineering, environmental studies, right-of-way acquisition, and construction

for a number of projects that would be started this year.

By far, the largest percentage of these funds are to continue ongoing demonstration projects. With regard to these continuations, I think most Members would agree that once Congress gives its approval to start a project, it should not turn around the next year and stop it in its tracks unless there are good, sound, environmental, or engineering, or cost reasons to do so. No such arguments are being made here.

The new projects represent a relatively small amount, less than two percent of the total recommended highway funding. We have received testimony or correspondence from many of the House Members whose areas are affected by these projects. I am sure they can all discuss the benefits of each of these projects. I believe they are all justified on the basis of safety or economic development. It is easy for a Member to criticize a project in someone else's district as being unjustified. There is no reason why Members should not decide on the allocation of 1 or 2 percent of our Federal highway spending.

Mr. Speaker, we have developed a balanced bill. It is within our 602(b) allocation. These projects have been included within our overall budget allocation—they are not budget busters. The projects are important to the Members and their districts.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this amendment essentially was proposed when the bill originally was on the floor, and it was defeated by a vote of 61 ayes to 365 noes. This is just beating a dead horse, it seems to me.

These projects are important projects. This money that is in here for these projects is money that would be spent otherwise, but it is being spent for projects that Members believe meet the priorities for their districts, and I suggest that Members know the priorities of their own districts fully as well as the department downtown.

It is entirely appropriate for Members to have those priorities expressed in this bill. The bill is within our 602(b) allocation. We do not have to reduce these projects to save money. If we do not fund the projects, they would fund something else. There would be no savings.

These projects have been the subject of hearings. This conference report involves a compromise, and I doubt that the other body will roll over and let us remove their projects. These are projects that are in the best interest of the people of the United States of America, and I suggest that we support the conference agreement and support these projects.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this objection pertains to what I think is a classic definition of what constitutes "pork." It is in this particular amendment.

The projects to which we are referring here come to about \$249 million. When I last spoke on this subject this bill was before us as the House version of the appropriation bill, with \$243 million demonstration projects which come out of the general fund, not out of the transportation fund. As it comes back from the Senate, we have \$504 million worth of demonstration projects. I cannot object to all of them, but this particular amendment does refer to new projects to which I can certainly address myself.

There has never been authorization for any of the 88 separate projects which are the subject matter of this particular amendment to which the House would concur. And I want to emphasize, so that everyone understands this, that it comes out of the general fund, not the highway transportation fund.

Mr. Speaker, we have an authorization bill for the Department of Transportation coming up. We will have probably anywhere from \$6 to \$7 billion of demonstration projects for special people and special districts at that time. Now, whether or not there will really be full authorization is a question I am not going to address, but I can verify that we do not have any kind of hearings or authorizations on these projects, and that, I say to my friends, is the very basic root of the kind of spending which people all over America are objecting to—especially when we talk about the debt. I do not have to talk about the tremendous amount of debt, over a half trillion dollars, that Congress will pile up during this year. In the final analysis, it is the obligation of Congress.

So I think we ought to understand this. The formula allocations ought to suffice. Instead we are getting \$6 to \$7 billion of demonstration projects in the authorization bill, which, by the way, constitutes an appropriation—they never have to go to the Appropriations Committee—and then they pile on an additional \$504 million more by means of this conference report. That should not be happening.

All I can do is object as to \$250 million of it and say that we ought to do something about that. It is up to Congress. The President cannot line-item veto. We will not give him that authority. We will not go ahead and have a constitutional amendment so we can balance the budget. We have not balanced a budget for 22 years in a row. We should tell that to the people back home and ask them if there is any rational explanation for it.

I can give the Members reasons, because what we are doing here with this

appropriation bill is what piles on the debt. Understandably, we are all competitive people and we would like to have what is best for our districts. I am not saying these projects are necessarily good, bad, or indifferent. I am saying they have never even seen the light of day in a substantive way in the committee which is to authorize them, and it is up to us, it seems to me, to police ourselves. The judiciary cannot do it, and we will not give the executive any kind of authority to do it.

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

Mr. FAWELL. I cannot yield, because I have several other Members who would like to address themselves to this subject, and I understand the gentleman has his own time. I do not know if I am going to run out of time or not.

□ 1510

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I realize not many people like to read these reports, but they are fascinating once you get hold of them. The gentleman has hit upon a very interesting amendment here. I just want to make the point that it is very interesting to look where some of the money is coming from in order to pay for the projects that are in the bill. It is being taken out of the nuclear waste transportation safety demonstration projects.

In other words, what we are doing is robbing an account aimed at the safe transportation of nuclear waste in order to put money into these projects.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell Members what is more important than nuclear waste safety. We are going to put a bike path in the city of North Miami. We are going to put bike path in the city of North Miami Beach. We are going to put a bike path in Dade County for Aventura and Sunny Isles. That is more important than nuclear waste safety, at least according to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that maybe the American public would rather be protected from the hazards of moving nuclear waste around the country than to be putting bike paths into the city of North Miami.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DURBIN], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, a little bit of knowledge is a dangerous thing. The previous speaker noted the fact that some \$4.6 million is being transferred from the nuclear waste transportation safety demonstration project to these highway demonstration projects. The gentleman suggests that nuclear waste transportation safety is a high priority, and should be.

In fact, this subcommittee agrees with the gentleman from Pennsylvania

[Mr. WALKER]. Had the gentleman continued to read this committee report and read it closely, he would have found the same amount of money reappropriated in New Mexico for expressly the same purpose, nuclear waste transportation safety.

The money is not being allocated to bike paths, it is being allocated for nuclear waste transportation safety under a new heading and a new name. So the gentleman's point, I am afraid if he looks closely, is not as telling as he would suggest.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL], we have had this debate before. The gentleman from Illinois is well aware of the fact that we have not passed a highway authorization bill. Many of the projects included in this listing are the very same projects included in that authorization bill.

Mr. Speaker, let me go on to say that the hearings which we held on these projects brought in members, chairmen and directors of State departments of transportation from across the United States, who testified in favor of each of these projects.

In fact, in his home State of Illinois, which I am sure the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] is well acquainted with, in each instance there is not a single project included here that does not require at least a State match, and perhaps a local match as well.

In other words, the Senate and local departments of transportation believe in these projects. This is not the whim of some individual Member. These are within a master plan, and they are projects which they are prepared to put their money on the line to fund.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that the Illinois Department of Transportation from the home State of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] has testified in favor of the same projects included in this bill. For the gentleman to stand and suggest that these are just wish lists of Members of Congress, really disparages the process which the subcommittee has been involved in for many months.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman goes on to suggest we are talking about \$249 million under these demonstration projects. The gentleman is correct. But, please, put in perspective that these demonstration projects that the gentleman refers to in this amendment in their totality represent less than 1½ percent of the money that is being appropriated in this bill.

I am afraid one would take from the statement of the gentleman earlier that the opposite is true, that virtually all the bill consists of demonstration projects. That is not true. We are dealing with 1½ percent of a bill under this amendment.

Finally, the gentleman is concerned about the budget deficit. Every Member of this Chamber shares his concern.



But the gentleman understands that when the President of the United States submitted a budget to this Congress, he put an upper limit on our spending. The Committee on the Budget allocated the money, the Committee on Appropriations reallocated the money, and this spending within this bill is within the President's budget request.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wants a balanced budget, please take the message to your President and start with his budget request at a balanced level. That has not been the case.

In fact, here we are dealing with projects that have had hearings, that have State and local match. They are projects that are deserving. The money is not taken away from nuclear waste transportation. We have debated this matter at length. I think the House has spoken before.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DURBIN. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I heard the gentleman talking about the fact that this Congress has not enacted a balanced budget. I was curious if the gentleman is aware of a balanced budget being sent to the Congress by the President?

It occurs to me if one takes a look at the budgets sent to this Congress since 1980, in every single case the proposals and requests coming from the White House in those budgets are for hundreds of billions of dollars of deficits. If you add all those budgets up, you will find that the failure of Congress is a failure because we followed the requests of the President. It is unfortunate, because we should not have done that. These Presidents have requested very large Federal deficits and, unfortunately, the Congress has complied.

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

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

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I simply want to make this perfectly clear: All I am saying here is that insofar as \$249 million is concerned, which comes out of the general fund, not the transportation fund, there has, as far as these bills are concerned, never been any authorization. Now, maybe if hearings are still going on next week, maybe some of these might appear in that authorization.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, if I might reclaim my time, only because I have a limited time, I do not quarrel with the gentleman, and I do not think he quarrels with me. Many of these are included in the authorization bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, just let me say that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] has indicated that the President does not have a line item veto for these

projects. While that is indeed the case, the President, through OMB, has also indicated that he approved of the bill and that the bill would not be subject to a veto. So I would think that these projects, since they will be signed into law by the President, should not be objected to on that basis.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BALLENGER].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say that just because the President of the United States does not send a balanced budget to the Congress, does not mean that we do not have some responsibility. In my considered opinion, that does not make it right.

I can see right now that my grandchildren are going to have to pay for three bicycle paths in Dade County. I would like to say I rise to commend my colleague from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] and support his efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I also object to the funding of some 88 highway demonstration projects earmarked in the conference report for the Department of Transportation appropriations bill. These projects carry a price tag of \$249 million, certainly nothing to treat casually. To the best of my knowledge, none of these projects have been authorized by the appropriate committee, in this case the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, of which I am a member.

Mr. Speaker, when the House considered these bills in July, I supported the amendment of the gentleman to cut \$243 million from this bill by eliminating 63 demonstration projects. That amendment failed. I have no doubt that the same fate awaits this effort.

Nonetheless, with an estimated \$362 billion deficit, I feel strongly that I must take advantage of any opportunity to reduce runaway spending. I urge Members do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I can honestly say in my 25 years in public life, I have never confronted an issue more frustrating than that of getting the Federal spending under control. I am amazed at the way we spend money in Washington. Members of Congress vote for project after project, with little concern about how we will pay the bill.

Mr. Speaker, think about it this time. Vote to eliminate these projects.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COX].

□ 1520

Mr. COX of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

It might be helpful to the Members of the House to share just briefly one of the so-called pork projects that this committee has been so willing to listen to the needs of the people of this country and respond to.

I refer to a short stretch of highway in northwest Illinois.

The gentleman from Illinois is probably aware that many of his constituents probably use this highway on a regular basis traveling back and forth from Galena and the other beautiful parts of northwest Illinois. This is a two-lane portion of road in the middle of a four-lane highway that stretches from the western edge of South Dakota to Chicago.

This is a beautiful part of the country, hills, valleys; there are real problems with highway development in this 50-mile stretch.

The Illinois Department of Transportation totally supports the effort to put these funds into research to determine if we can complete a four-lane highway. The State of Iowa has requested that this 50-mile stretch of highway be completed.

This so-called pork project supports and serves the people of southwest Wisconsin, the people of east central Iowa, and the people of northwest Illinois.

I suggest that the committee has served those people well in responding to this need. I urge that the opposition from the gentleman from Illinois be defeated.

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

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

There has been a lot of confusing statements made here. Every project is important to a congressional district. There is no question about that. But the fact of the matter is we have to set priorities around this place because we have not set priorities on spending. We continue to authorize and appropriate money for everybody's project, all of these projects.

This year we are going to have a \$400 billion-plus deficit. That is on top of a \$4 trillion national debt that has quadrupled in the last 10 years. The legacy we are leaving our children is unbelievable, unbelievable.

There are 126 highway demonstration projects in this bill totaling \$589 million that have not been authorized in the authorization bill, and this money is going to be taken out of the general fund revenues, not out of the highway trust fund revenues. The highway trust fund revenues are going to be asked to yield 450 to 500 projects totaling \$5.6 to \$7.5 billion. Those are demonstration projects.

These are going to be on top of that. I would just say to my colleagues this ought to be done through the authorization process where they review each individual project. And if it is meritorious, it is authorized and paid for out of the highway trust funds.

This is coming out of the general fund revenues.

The problem is, we have not controlled our appetite for spending. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says the White House is going to sign it. That does not mean the White House is for all these projects.

I heard his remarks earlier today. He said they do have some objections but he said they would sign it. That is a long way from saying they support it.

I would just like to say to my colleagues that we have got to get control of our appetite for spending. I have been fighting these pork-barrel projects all year long. Every time I come down here, I hear my colleagues saying, "This is so important for my district; this is so important for my district."

We had 3,000 special pork-barrel projects requested by 370 Members of the Congress from 1 subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, 1 out of 13 subcommittees. We are having thousands and thousands and thousands of projects requested by Members of this body.

Unless we learn to prioritize, we are never going to get control of spending in this place. What does that portend for the future of this country? I tell my colleagues, interest on the national debt is running at 18 cents out of every tax dollar. That means 18 cents is not going for helping with hospital costs, health care costs, the homeless and all those other things that we think are important.

What does that mean? That means that our kids are going to have to pay for this. They are going to have to pay for that interest which is growing, so they are going to have to pay for that deficit, and they are going to really look back on us and say we did not carry our responsibilities well.

The future generations of this country are going to have to deal with this. We have got to learn to live within our means.

I would like to say to my colleagues, let us start prioritizing spending around here.

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

I just simply want to say that this money would still be spent for transportation projects because it is within the 602(b) allocation for this committee. The only distinction that is being made here is will this be spent for transportation projects that are the subject of priorities of Members who have a fairly good idea of what their priorities are in the district or will they be spent for transportation projects which may have some other priority?

We have just as good an idea here in this body of what the priorities in our districts are for transportation projects as they do downtown. I urge that the amendment be defeated.

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, just because we have the money to spend, does that mean we have to spend it? I mean, if these are pork barrel projects.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, these are good projects that Members feel are important. The funds would be spent otherwise for other transportation projects. These simply reflect the priorities that Members have in their districts for transportation projects which this money is earmarked for. This money is earmarked for transportation.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, what the gentleman is saying is if we do not spend it for these projects, there would be other projects that we would spend it for because we have the money to spend.

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I was accused here a few minutes ago of not having read the report and not seeing that somewhere else we picked up this money for nuclear waste transportation safety. I know the gentleman's staff now has checked on this matter.

As I understand it, the money goes to the Santa Fe relief route bypass. Is that not correct?

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, that is the same thing.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will continue to yield, that is not what it says. It says, in other words, what we have here is we have money that was for nuclear waste safety.

Mr. COUGHLIN. That is the identical project. It is the same project.

Mr. WALKER. But it looks strangely suspicious that the project on one hand is labeled as the nuclear waste transportation safety.

Mr. COUGHLIN. It is the same project except with a different title.

Mr. WALKER. It sounds as though we are backing away from nuclear waste safety, and we are now putting money into the New Mexico Santa Fe relief route bypass.

I will tell the gentleman, I have now been through the report and I do not find anywhere where we picked back up the money for nuclear waste safety.

Maybe this is the same project.

Mr. COUGHLIN. It is the same project.

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, if I could enlighten the distinguished gen-

tleman from Pennsylvania, it is a very, very honorable and worthwhile appropriation. And it is precisely for the purpose that the gentleman wants it for. It is a bypass route that prevents the waste from going through the city where it could be very harmful to the residents.

This is a safety appropriation to route the waste around the community, perfectly legitimate and absolutely necessary.

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

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I am confused as to why we changed the title. Why do we not call it what it was before? It sounds to me as though it is for another purpose here of maybe building roads that may or may not be used for nuclear waste safety demonstrations.

My guess is there is a reason for retitling it.

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I just want to say that the public roads of the United States are available to all motorists. We do not build a road for nuclear trucks only around the city. There will be other vehicles on it.

It is a dual purpose highway. It is a wise expenditure of funds.

What it is doing is it is building the infrastructure of America. There are many here who complain that we waste money on America. I do not agree with that.

They call it pork when we build roads and highways and bridges and make these highways safe and provide for the transportation of people and goods and services. They do not like that.

They would rather spend it on their priorities, and their priorities are defense.

I tell my colleagues that is a misappropriation in my judgment. What we need to be doing is emphasizing education, health, and transportation. That is what this bill is about, is transportation.

I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his good job in that effort. He is a true patriot.

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

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

□ 1530

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PENNY].

Mr. PENNY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose amendment No. 64 which was reported in technical disagreement.

Included in amendment 64 are 88 new construction projects, 50 of which were included in this bill as it left the House, 38 of which were added by the



Senate during conference committee consideration of this measure. The total appropriation for these projects is nearly \$250 million.

This amendment No. 64 contains the bulk of the demonstration projects funded by the bill. Those on the committee called these special demonstration projects. Others would call these projects pork. Two hundred and fifty million dollars may not be a big slice of the money in this budget, but when we add this \$250 million to the \$150 million in designated or pork projects included in the housing bill earlier, and other pork projects that will be added to virtually every other appropriation bill to come through this House, pretty soon it does begin to add up.

Last fall we went through an excruciating experience here as Members of this Congress and the White House sat down together to negotiate a budget agreement, a budget agreement designed to reduce deficits over the next 5 years by \$500 billion. Painful decisions were made; cuts in various programs were suggested, some of which were implemented. All of that seems to me to have set a tone in this institution about fiscal responsibility, and yet here we are 1 short year later forgetting about the deficit and going right back to business as usual with 88 projects designated by this committee adding up to \$250 million in the first year. And this is not the end of these projects. They go on and on, and they cost more and more.

The bottom line is that we cannot say one thing one year and another thing the next. We cannot set a standard for fiscal responsibility with one speech, and then undo it with this kind of pork-barrel spending in the next.

This is wrong. Amendment No. 64 ought to be rejected by this House. I urge support for the efforts of my colleague from Illinois.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time at the moment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, we have had quite a lecture here a couple of minutes ago about the fact that we want to spend the money on defense, and you all want to spend it elsewhere. I think if the gentleman will check, this gentleman votes against the defense bills, too, because I think we have wasteful spending in those.

I was just saying to the gentleman that it is my guess that he voted for more defense bills lately than I have.

I wanted to also go to the point of how much of this money is going to absolutely essential infrastructure. I am going to be reading from the bill. I want Members to understand where the

money is coming from, at least part of the money: "\$249,146,000, together with \$4,628,000 to be derived by transfer from the 'Nuclear Waste Transportation Safety Demonstration Project.'" That is where they are getting the money.

Where is the money going? It is going to a lot of projects here, and some of my colleagues have detailed them. But among other things, these highly essential projects are getting money: I mentioned before the bike paths in the city of North Miami and the city of North Miami Beach, and Dade County for Adventure and Sunny Isles. Those are certainly more important to some people I guess than nuclear waste safety. They are not to this gentleman.

I find a highway beautification project in Grand forks, ND. I do not know whether that is more important than nuclear safety or not, but my guess is that it is not.

I find interstate emergency call box system. We would probably find all kinds of people who are willing to bid on those kind of systems if we would allow them to make a little bit of money out of it, but instead we are including it in here, and it becomes more important to the country than including insurance for nuclear waste safety.

I would suggest that is a wrong set of priorities. I would suggest that this amendment is wrong set priorities, and my colleagues are absolutely right in the substance of the amendment. We are doing the wrong things, and in the case of the overspending, I think that it is adding to the deficit, and it is unconscionable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] has 4 minutes remaining and will be the first to give a closing statement.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL] is recognized for 4 minutes to close debate.

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I know I have not expressed myself as well as I would like. But let me make this reiteration, and I apologize for it.

We are talking about general funds going for transportation purposes. In and of itself that ought to shock Members, when we realize we are going to have \$6 billion to \$7 billion of these projects in the new authorization of the DOT, which is coming up next week. As a practical matter, these projects will become an entitlement in that bill because they never will, in the 5- or 6-year authorization, ever have to go back to the Appropriations Committee. It is \$7 billion of demonstration projects that will make every heart in this body, just ecstatic, I guess, because they are getting what they want, and yet that is not enough.

Every year during the authorization period what do we see? We traipse back to the Appropriations Committee and we scrape some more money out of the Treasury, \$300 billion, \$400 billion, \$500 billion. I mean to say \$500 million, excuse me. I get mixed up with millions, billions and trillions.

We cannot explain that to the people back home. Is not \$7 billion enough for Rockford or for Illinois or Wisconsin or wherever? When will we ever stop? When can we ever say no to something?

We cannot even pin it on the President. I am not saying Presidents are without fault when they send budgets down here. But who controls the legislature? Congress. Congress controls it. We know that we control it.

We can look at all of the 602(b) allocations and we can say, "Why, we've enough money here." In effect, the answer I think my good friend from Pennsylvania made to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] was that we have the money and we are going to spend it.

We do not have to spend it. We do not have to spend the \$247 million here, for instance.

That is what people cannot understand about this Congress, and that is why our reputation is not what it ought to be. We can talk all we want at townhall meetings about the fact that, gee whiz, we have not balanced a budget for 22 or 23 years, and only three or four times in the last 40-some years. Three times under Ike Eisenhower, and one with Kennedy.

Now we are paying \$300 billion just to pay interest on the national debt, just to pay interest. I say to all my liberal friends, my gosh, what we could do with \$300 billion. We would not have the problems that we have right now.

But we have the problems right now because we cannot say no to anybody or anything. And of course, when the largess is spread around enough, I ain't got a chance of winning this thing.

□ 1540

All you can do, I guess, is talk to America and express the fact of your frustration of being one person who is in the minority, 101 votes behind, and I do not have a chance: There are always good reasons to spend money. And these projects may possibly be in Rockford, yes, I'd love to go to Rockford and have a nice highway to ride upon.

You know, it has been stated that the highway people back home are for this, and I have a quote that I can give you around here somewhere that states otherwise. The highway people back home are saying that they are going to have to start chasing in on these special projects which are not priority for the State highway departments.

Let me quote from the Congressional Quarterly: "As much as State and Federal officials want a highway bill, they are continually frustrated by dem-

onstration projects which allow lawmakers to push a project to the head of the priority list and distort the formulas"—and I am not even talking about that, because you have got \$6 or \$7 billion in the next 6 years. It ought to be enough.

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

Mr. Speaker, if I may, I will say once more that the time to decide how much money is going to be spent on transportation versus other programs was during the consideration of the budget resolution.

The funds that were allocated for spending on transportation are being spent in this bill, and they are being spent, I believe, wisely.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

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

I urge adoption of amendment No. 64. The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 330, nays 96, not voting 7, as follows:

(Roll No. 300)

YEAS—330

Abercrombie	Byron	Dymally
Ackerman	Callahan	Early
Alexander	Camp	Eckart
Anderson	Campbell (CO)	Edwards (CA)
Andrews (ME)	Cardin	Edwards (OK)
Annunzio	Carr	Edwards (TX)
Anthony	Chandler	Emerson
Applegate	Chapman	Engel
Aspin	Clay	Erdreich
Atkins	Clement	Espy
AuCoin	Clinger	Evans
Bacchus	Coleman (TX)	Fascell
Barrett	Collins (MI)	Fazio
Bateman	Conyers	Feighan
Bellenson	Costello	Fish
Bennett	Coughlin	Flake
Bentley	Cox (IL)	Foglietta
Bereuter	Coyne	Ford (MI)
Berman	Cramer	Ford (TN)
Bevill	Darden	Frank (MA)
Bilbray	Davis	Frost
Bilirakis	de la Garza	Gallagher
Bliley	DeFazio	Gallo
Boehlert	DeLauro	Gaydos
Bonior	DeLay	Gejdenson
Borski	Dellums	Gephardt
Boucher	Derrick	Geren
Boxer	Dickinson	Gibbons
Brewster	Dicks	Gillmor
Brooks	Dingell	Gilman
Broomfield	Dixon	Glickman
Browder	Donnelly	Gonzalez
Brown	Dooley	Gordon
Bruce	Dorgan (ND)	Grandy
Bryant	Downey	Green
Bustamante	Durbin	Guarini

Hall (OH)	McDermott	Roybal
Hall (TX)	McEwen	Russo
Hamilton	McGrath	Sabo
Hammerschmidt	McHugh	Sangmeister
Hansen	McMillan (NC)	Sarpallus
Harris	McMillen (MD)	Savage
Hatcher	McNulty	Sawyer
Hayes (IL)	Meyers	Saxton
Hayes (LA)	Mfume	Scheuer
Hefner	Michel	Schiff
Henry	Miller (CA)	Schroeder
Hertel	Miller (WA)	Schulze
Hoagland	Mineta	Schumer
Hobson	Mink	Serrano
Hochbrueckner	Moakley	Sharp
Horn	Molinari	Shaw
Horton	Mollohan	Shuster
Houghton	Montgomery	Sikorski
Hoyer	Moran	Siskis
Hubbard	Morella	Skaggs
Hughes	Morrison	Skeen
Hutto	Mrazek	Slattery
Jacobs	Murphy	Slaughter (NY)
James	Murtha	Slaughter (FL)
Jefferson	Myers	Smith (VA)
Jenkins	Nagle	Smith (IA)
Johnson (SD)	Natcher	Smith (NJ)
Johnston	Neal (MA)	Smith (OR)
Jones (GA)	Nichols	Snowe
Jones (NC)	Nowak	Solarz
Jontz	Nussle	Spence
Kanjorski	Oakar	Spratt
Kaptur	Oberstar	Staggers
Kennedy	Obey	Stallings
Kennelly	Olin	Stark
Kildee	Oliver	Stokes
Kleczka	Ortiz	Studds
Kolter	Orton	Sundquist
Kopetski	Owens (NY)	Swett
Kostmayer	Owens (UT)	Swift
LaFalce	Packard	Synar
Lagomarsino	Pallone	Tanner
Lancaster	Panetta	Tauzin
Lantos	Parker	Thomas (CA)
LaRocco	Pastor	Thomas (GA)
Laughlin	Patterson	Thornton
Leach	Payne (NJ)	Torres
Lehman (CA)	Payne (VA)	Torricelli
Lehman (FL)	Pelosi	Towns
Lent	Perkins	Trafficant
Levin (MI)	Peterson (FL)	Traxler
Levine (CA)	Pickett	Unsold
Lewis (CA)	Pickle	Upton
Lewis (FL)	Poshard	Valentine
Lewis (GA)	Price	Vander Jagt
Lightfoot	Pursell	Vento
Lipinski	Quillen	Visclosky
Livingston	Rahall	Volkmer
Lloyd	Rangel	Vucanovich
Long	Ravenel	Walsh
Lowery (CA)	Reed	Waters
Lowey (NY)	Regula	Waxman
Manton	Richardson	Weber
Markey	Ridge	Weiss
Marlenee	Riggs	Wheat
Martin	Rinaldo	Whitten
Martinez	Ritter	Wilson
Matsui	Roe	Wise
Mavroules	Rosmer	Wolf
Mazzoli	Rogers	Wolpe
McCandless	Ros-Lehtinen	Wyden
McCloskey	Rostenkowski	Yates
McCrery	Roukema	Yatron
McDade	Rowland	Young (AK)

NAYS—96

Allard	Crane	Hancock
Andrews (NJ)	Cunningham	Hastert
Andrews (TX)	Dannemeyer	Hefley
Archer	Doolittle	Herger
Armey	Dornan (CA)	Huckaby
Baker	Dreier	Hunter
Ballenger	Duncan	Hyde
Barton	English	Inhofe
Boehner	Ewing	Ireland
Bunning	Fawell	Johnson (CT)
Burton	Fields	Johnson (TX)
Campbell (CA)	Franks (CT)	Kasich
Carper	Gekas	Klug
Coble	Gilchrest	Kolbe
Coleman (MO)	Gingrich	Kyl
Combest	Goodling	Lukens
Condit	Goss	Machtley
Cooper	Gradison	McCollum
Cox (CA)	Gunderson	McCurdy

Miller (OH)	Rhodes	Stenholm
Moody	Roberts	Stump
Moorhead	Rohrabacher	Tallon
Neal (NC)	Roth	Taylor (MS)
Oxley	Sanders	Taylor (NC)
Paxon	Santorum	Thomas (WY)
Pease	Schaefer	Walker
Penny	Sensenbrenner	Weldon
Peterson (MN)	Shays	Williams
Petri	Skelton	Wylie
Porter	Smith (TX)	Young (FL)
Ramstad	Solomon	Zeliff
Ray	Stearns	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—7

Barnard	Holloway	Washington
Collins (IL)	Hopkins	
Dwyer	Rose	

□ 1605

Messrs. RHODES, COOPER, GOSS, MOORHEAD, PAXON, ENGLISH, and SKELTON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. MCCANDLESS, GALLEGLY, MARTIN, MCEWEN, DORGAN of North Dakota, PALLONE, and HALL of Texas changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 67: Page 27, after line 5, insert:

FEASIBILITY, DESIGN, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING

For necessary expenses to carry out feasibility, design, environmental and preliminary engineering studies \$23,485,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all funds appropriated under this head shall be exempted from any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

FEASIBILITY, DESIGN, ENVIRONMENTAL, ENGINEERING

For necessary expenses to carry out feasibility, design, environmental, and preliminary engineering studies, \$18,448,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] and I request 20 minutes be allocated to me.



The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] opposed to the motion?

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I am not opposed to the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] will be recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

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

Mr. Speaker, this is the same motion that we argued so thoroughly. I will not take the time of the House to make the same arguments.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the motion.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the chairman has indicated, this is exactly the same issue that we just went through. I would hope that we would not take the time of our colleagues again in extended debate.

Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

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

Mr. Speaker, in the highway authorization bill it is estimated there is going to be 450 to 500 projects that are going to cost between \$6 billion and \$8 billion and \$7.5 billion to take care of the special demonstration projects, highway projects, for this Nation.

□ 1610

Mr. Speaker, that money would come out of the highway trust fund, and that is justifiable. The highway trust funds are supposed to be used for highway projects. But the moneys in this amendment, \$18½ million, will be coming out of the general fund revenues. That is a misuse of these general fund revenues. It is not designed for that purpose.

In addition to that, unlike the previous amendment, this money is being spent for feasibility studies, designed environmental and preliminary engineering studies, for those projects. What that means simply to my colleagues, and I hope that they are paying attention to this, is, as my colleagues know, when we talk about the deficit, we ought to all be paying attention to this. I mean it is going to be \$400 billion plus this year. We have quadrupled the deficit. The national debt in the last year has gone from \$1 trillion to \$4 trillion, and yet nobody pays attention, and we just keep on voting for these pork barrel projects. We ought to at least listen to what is going on around this place.

Now in this particular amendment we are going to spend \$18½ million on feasibility, and design and engineering studies, which means this is just a camel's nose getting under the tent. All of these projects in this amendment are going to come back and cost \$20, \$30, \$40, \$50, \$60, \$70, \$80, \$100 million more in the future. It is not going to end with this amendment, and these are all pork barrel projects, and I would just like to say to my colleagues that, if we are going to have special projects, demonstration projects, then they should be through the authorization process, and highway authorization bill, because then the money will come out of the highway authorization funds and not out of the general fund revenues.

Now, as I have said many times on this floor, we have got an institutional problem here. A lot of my colleagues come up with special projects that are important to their districts, and I understand that. Every single Congressman wants to do something for the people back home, and he wants to get reelected, and he realizes, if he gets a bicycle path, or a new road, or access road or something for his district, it is going to help him with his constituents.

But while we are trying to do those things, Mr. Speaker, we should look at the big picture, and that is: What is this going to do to the country economically, and what is it doing to the future of this Nation?

The deficit this year is going to be the largest in history. The deficit this year is going to be \$400 billion, the largest in U.S. history, following right on the heels of the second largest tax increase in history, and that tax increase last year was designed to get us on a road toward a balanced budget in 4 to 5 years. And what happened? Instead of a \$200 billion deficit, this year it is going to be double that.

Now why is that happening? It is because we are not controlling our appetite for spending, and I wish everybody in this country could see the inattention there is to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, does anybody care that the national debt has quadrupled in 10 years? Does anybody care that the interest on the national debt is 18 percent of total spending? Three hundred billion dollars is going just for interest this year. Does anybody care about that?

I do not think we care in this Chamber anymore because the spending goes on unabated.

Last year, we came up with what was called the 4-percent solution. We wanted to pass a budget that set a limit on spending at no more than 4 percent above current levels of spending, really no more growth in spending, and 4 percent above the previous year's level. We did not even get a smell. It did not even get a hearing, and we ended up

passing a budget, a compromise, that was supposed to get control of the deficit, increased taxes \$137 billion, and what did we do? We doubled the deficit in 1 year. Four hundred billion dollars the deficit is going to be.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to my colleagues that we have to prioritize spending, we have to go through the authorization process, we have to start being choosy and set priorities, because, if we do not, the future generations of this country are really going to curse our inaction.

Mr. Speaker, I come down here time and again, and I say these things, and it falls on deaf ears. I can tell my colleagues right now that this amendment will not get over 90 or 95 votes, our position on this, but the fact of the matter is we all know we are the problem, and we have got to get control of this.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The Chair will remind all persons in the Gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestations of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House. The Chair would ask them to refrain from applause.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get into more repetitious rhetoric, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me just say that this does not really have to do with the deficit. As I said with the previous amendment, that was decided, the amount of money to be spent on transportation was decided, when we enacted the budget resolution. It would authorize this amount of money in the budget through our 602(b) allocation for transportation. We are within that 602(b) allocation in this transportation appropriations bill, and I urge support of the motion.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, this is an interesting amendment because, if one looks at it, what it says is that we are going to spend \$8½ million. When we add up who got the money, it is pretty clear that the House is not the beneficiary in this particular case. If we look at this, we find out that \$4.4 billion went to Chairman BYRD in the U.S. Senate, and then we find out that the Senator from New Jersey, the chairman of the Senate subcommittee, gets \$10.7 million out of the thing, and so \$15.1 million out of the \$18.5 goes to the two Senators who happen to have the most power in this area in the U.S. Senate. So, this is not even Members of

the House porking it. This is purely Senate pork.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] that it is not in order to characterize a Senator by name.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair.

May I refer to him by title?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No personal references.

Mr. WALKER. No personal references. Let me just say "some unknown Members of the Senate are responsible for \$15.1 million."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the gentleman that that, too, is not in order.

Mr. WALKER. Oh. Well, fine. Fifteen point one million of this did not come from the House.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, one has to wonder just exactly what we were negotiating here and whether anybody is going to stand up to people outside the House who seem to be loading up all of these bills. I find it somewhat appalling to go down through here and read West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, West Virginia, New Jersey, New Jersey, New Jersey, New Jersey, New Jersey. It is clear to me that we do not have a sense of what has to be done to hold down budget deficits in this country and that we had better find a way to curb the spending appetites or this country is in dire, dire straits.

A no vote on this amendment is certainly the appropriate vote.

1620

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FAWELL].

Mr. FAWELL. Mr. Speaker, I feel constrained to certainly back up my good friend from the State of Indiana [Mr. BURTON]. He is fighting a valiant, if a bit of a losing, battle. But I for one appreciate the continuous work the gentleman does here on the floor of the House. I think a lot of us do. Maybe our votes do not always show it, but I want to give him some praise for what he is doing.

I know that all of us are very busy people and there are a lot of things that we cannot keep up with. But I was just reviewing the conference report, and, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] has pointed out, here is \$18.5 million being taken out of the general fund to supplement about \$7 billion of new entitlements for demonstration projects that will run for the next 5 or 6 years—entitlements because nobody will ever have to go back to appropriations to justify the spending for the entitlement demonstration projects to which they are entitled as a result of the authorization bill, as it is now written, which will come before us next week.

Mr. Speaker, I thought I would just mention this: I look upon one of these feasibility studies in regard to a certain highway not too far from Washington. There is \$800,000 of general funds for a feasibility study. Then, according to the report that I have, on the authorization bill—which, by the way, is equivalent to an appropriation, as it comes out of the authorizing committee—there is another \$150 million for the same project.

What happens here is it just picks up an additional \$800,000 from the general fund. Most of us just do not have the time to ferret these projects out. We do not have enough staff to be able to do it and, oftentimes, we wait until the end of the session to try to figure out just what did happen to the taxpayer and how it did happen.

I look at some of these others and find the same thing. There is \$6.2 million more added on to \$32,000 for a particular feasibility study. There is another \$700,000 in the entitlement-program-soon-to-come that the taxpayer will have to pay for out of the authorizing committee.

Here is \$10.4 million more on top of \$4 million that is charged for a feasibility study here, and then they pick up another \$10.4 million out of the entitlement program which is the authorizing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I hope somebody is watching the store.

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

Mr. Speaker, last year when we raised the taxes on the American people by \$137 billion, we raised the gas tax by 5 cents and we put 2½ cents of that into the highway funds, and 2½ cents of that into the general funds.

Now this year we came back because we needed more money for the highway fund and wanted to raise the gas tax again by 5 cents a gallon. I understand that may be pared and we may end up with 3 cents, or 2½ cents, but you are going to be coming back here before too long asking for another tax increase to be saddled on the backs of all the people of this country.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we are going to ask the American people for more tax dollars, then we ought to spend that money responsibly.

One Member said a few minutes ago when I asked him if the money is authorized and we ought to spend it, and he said yes, that is right, because the money has been authorized, so we go ahead and spend it.

I remember back when I was in the State legislature in Indiana years ago. I was sitting in an office of one of the members of the bureaucracy, and he was standing around the corner and said to one of his aides, "Listen. The fiscal year ends in 2 weeks, and if we don't spend another \$100,000 or \$105,000, then we won't be able to ask for a

budget increase next biennium, because we will not have spent all the money we have for this biennium."

They were trying to figure out how to spend the money in the next 2 weeks so they could say they have to have a higher budget for the next 2 years.

Mr. Speaker, it seems to me this is the same kind of thing I have heard here today. If the money is authorized, we have to spend it.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have to spend it. We have a \$400 billion deficit this year alone. So if we have that kind of deficit, it seems to me we ought to be trying to figure out ways to economize, ways to prioritize, so we do not just spend that money, instead of saying the money has been authorized and we have to find a way to spend it. But that is what we are doing. It is the same thing I experienced when I was a State legislator, only here it is a lot worse.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago there was a movie that came out that starred Jimmy Stewart, one of my favorite actors. In that movie, called "Mr. Smith Goes to Washington," he makes a plea on the floor of the United States other body, and, after an exhausting filibuster, his opponents cave in and the righteous win out. This horrible special project that was going to take place in some Member of the other body's district or State was stopped.

Well, in real life that does not happen. At least it has not happened here. Because all this year I and my staff have been going through every single appropriations bill trying to cut the pork out, and we have not won one battle. We did get \$6.8 million cut out on a technicality, but we have not won one amendment on this floor.

Now, tell me something: Are there not any bad projects that come before these appropriations committees? Are there none of them that are pork projects? If so, why have we not voted one of them down? We have not voted one of them down.

So I would just like to say to Members, it is time that we start looking at this thing from the point of view of the taxpayers. If you asked taxpayers in this country do you want us to prioritize here in Congress, they would say yes. If you were to ask taxpayers if they wanted us to cut out wasteful pork barrel projects, they would say yes.

But the fact of the matter is, once we are elected, we do not ask. Collectively, we keep passing this stuff and keep digging a bigger and bigger hole. It is not just for us. We are all going to live pretty well. All the people that are adults today are going to live pretty well. But what are you leaving for the kids, for the future generations? You are leaving a heck of a legacy, a \$4 trillion debt.

Mr. Speaker, the debt has quadrupled in 10 years. Think about that. We have quadrupled the national debt in one



decade, and it is getting worse every year. We are going to add one-tenth of that more, at least one-tenth, this year. Where is it going to end?

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say to Members, start thinking about this. I have proposed these amendments because I think of it as the Chinese water torture. I have proposed these amendments not because they are going to pass. I am not under any false illusions. I know if there are 3,000 special pork barrel projects requested by one subcommittee by 370 Members of Congress, I know I do not have much of a chance to defeat a proposal. It is not likely to happen.

I figure if we use the Chinese water torture and just keep dropping this issue before us day in and day out, day in and day out, somebody in this place is going to get the message, and, eventually, one day, we will defeat one of these pork barrel projects.

I may have a heart attack, but I will be so happy when you carry me out to the hospital.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, these projects do represent transportation for the people of America. I might say that they were prioritized by the committee. These represent the projects that the committee considered of the highest priority.

Mr. Speaker, I urge agreement to the amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1630

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 68: Page 27, after line 5, insert:

#### CORRIDOR G IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

For the purpose of carrying out a demonstration of methods of eliminating traffic congestion, and to promote economic benefits for the area affected by the construction of the Corridor G segment of the Appalachian Highway System, there is hereby appropriated \$165,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all funds appropriated under this head shall be exempted from any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$148,500,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I am in opposition to the motion, and I ask for 20 minutes of time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman from Pennsylvania opposed to the motion?

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. COUGHLIN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

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

This is a continuation of a project we have funded in previous years, and I can assure my colleagues that we will not have a bill unless this motion is adopted.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, here we go again. This is the same issue that we have been debating on the previous amendments, essentially.

I hope that the motion will be supported.

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

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

I am going to call a rollcall vote on this one. I am going to call a rollcall vote on this one. I hope my colleagues are paying attention. Remember, there will be a vote on this one.

I will tell my colleagues why. That last amendment, amendment numbered 67, had \$4.4 million in it for one Member of the other body. This has \$148.5 million for that same Member of the other body, and he has promised his constituents back in West Virginia that he is going to bring \$1 billion home for his State.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind the speaker that references, personal references to the other body, are not allowed on the floor.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I apologize.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will continue.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, some Member of the other body has promised—

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman must desist from a personal reference to any Member of the other body.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Some Member of one of the Houses somewhere has promised to bring \$1 billion in pork barrel projects home to his State.

If that ain't pork, what is it?

He does not want to bring home the bacon. He wants to bring home the whole pig.

I say to my colleagues, we voted down every single amendment we have been talking about over the last 6 months as far as pork is concerned, but this is a glaring example.

Last week we voted for, I think it was \$60 million and some or \$80 million and some for an FBI fingerprint lab in this particular area, the same person. Here we are today. We had \$4.4 million in another amendment, and another one for \$8 million in another amendment, just because this Member has some power in this place.

I would just like to say, where is it going to end? This is absolutely unadulterated, blatant pork, and we all know it. Even the members of the Committee on Appropriations know it.

I would just like to say to my colleagues, we ought to take that first step toward fiscal responsibility by defeating this motion.

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

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

I would just like to remind Members that it takes a vote in both bodies to pass an appropriations bill. It takes a vote in both bodies to pass an appropriations bill.

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

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

I urge support of the motion offered by the chairman of our subcommittee.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KYL].

Mr. KYL. Mr. Speaker, I think that all of us should commend the gentleman from Indiana for the courageous stand that he has taken in trying to cut some money from a budget that we all know does not meet the expectations of the American people. They understand that the budget is out of balance, that we have got to bring it into balance. That means we have to reduce spending and somehow we have to make tough choices to do that.

This body has not been willing to do that on any of the amendments so far that the gentleman has proposed. We all understand the reasons for that. I think that the courage of the gentleman from Indiana ought to be recognized by the Members of this body, many of whom would like in their hearts to support what he is doing but for certain reasons cannot do so.

I for one want to commend him for what he is doing and offer my support and suggest that he should be supported in this amendment.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER].

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

I just want to find out here, we were admonished in a couple of debates earlier today that these are absolutely essential national projects, they have only the highest priority concerns, that these are the ones that the committee has selected above all others as being the most meritorious projects, and only these projects should be done.

Can someone tell me what this one does that is absolutely essential? We have just passed the amendment a minute ago that said that Route 9 in West Virginia is absolutely essential to the national interest. We cannot get along without it. We just said that Route 2 in West Virginia is absolutely essential to the national interest. We cannot get along without it.

We just said that Route 52 in West Virginia is absolutely essential to the national interest. We cannot get along without it. Here we have \$148.5 million for corridor G in West Virginia.

What is absolutely essential about corridor G?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I might remind the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it takes two bodies of the House to pass an appropriations bill.

Mr. WALKER. I understand that, but we are spending taxpayer money here. This represents all of the salaries of families in my district that work very, very hard for their money. We are spending it all away to the tune of \$148.5 million. I want to be assured that this is an absolutely essential bit of spending.

Can the gentleman tell me why this above all else is money that has to be spend this year in this bill?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. If the gentleman will continue to yield, the only thing I can tell the gentleman is that the Senate has a responsibility, too. I am sure they acted in full responsibility to be sure that this project was worthwhile.

Mr. WALKER. What did the Senate tell the committee that is absolutely essential about the corridor G project?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this is an important project, and we have to take the Senate on good faith.

Mr. WALKER. Is it an important project or is it an absolutely essential project?

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we have to deal with the Senate in good faith.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I understand that. Certainly there is negotiation that goes on here. What is absolutely essential that we spend \$148.5 million on in this bill?

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

Mr. WALKER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CARR], if he has an answer to my question of why this program is absolutely essential beyond all other things that we have to do as a country.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, against that standard, I do not think there is anyone here who can answer the gentleman's question, certainly not to his satisfaction.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, when we have a \$400 billion deficit and a \$4 trillion debt, I would suggest that we ought to limit ourselves to absolutely essential projects.

What I am hearing is this probably is not one of them.

Mr. CARR. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would claim down just a minute.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I have a hard time being calm when we are spending this kind of money. I will be happy to calm down.

Mr. CARR. If the gentleman would continue to yield, we all understand the gentleman's passions.

I would like to offer a couple of thoughts here. First, I think the gentleman is well within his rights to ask any question of the committee. I think that all of these projects should be readily defended by the committee to the Member's, perhaps not to the Member's satisfaction, because my suspicion is that he comes from an inclination that will not admit to a favorable answer.

□ 1640

Mr. WALKER. Could the gentleman give me say a 20-second answer here so that we understand the essential nature of this project?

Mr. CARR. If the gentleman will read the report, there is a thing called the Appalachian Regional Commission. It was established many years ago for the betterment of the Appalachian region, which was a poverty-stricken area. We all know that. We all know there are a variety of Federal projects that run to the Appalachian region. This is one of the corridors that was designated in the Appalachian highway system.

Mr. WALKER. Is Route 9 also in that corridor?

Mr. CARR. I do not believe Route 9 is.

Mr. WALKER. Route 9 was given \$1 million in the amendment before. So this is the project that is the essential one?

Mr. CARR. We are talking about a matter that has been raised by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. WALKER. My point is, as a House, if I can reclaim my time—

Mr. CARR. We are talking about all kinds of priorities, some of which the gentleman may like in his area.

Mr. WALKER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. CARR. The gentleman asked a question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] has the time.

Mr. WALKER. Given that the gentleman has not given me an answer—

Mr. CARR. I am trying to, and you are trying to obfuscate it by—

Mr. WALKER. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the time.

Mr. WALKER. I thank the Chair. The gentleman from Michigan seems to want to use the time.

My only point is that in the amendment before, Route 9, Route 2, Route 52, all of them got money. Evidently they were not essential projects and corridor G is an essential project, so we should not have given the money to the amendment before. But I did not hear the gentleman say that when we debated that before.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself so much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let us stop and think about how the process is supposed to work. The highway authorization bill is supposed to be the vehicle for highway projects. This is not the highway authorization bill. This is an appropriation bill.

The reason, I suppose the reason that this \$148.5 million is in this appropriation bill is because the gentleman who was pushing this could not get \$148.5 million through the authorization bill. So what did he do? Because he has a very strong position, he put it in a bill that he could control, an appropriation bill, because he could not get it in the authorization bill.

In addition to that, which adds insult to injury, I want to read the language on page 29 of the bill. It says: "Provided, That all funds appropriated under this heading shall be exempted from any limitation on obligations for federal aid highways and highway safety construction programs." Not only are we taking this \$148.5 million out of the authorization process and sticking it where it does not belong in an appropriation bill. In addition, we are exempting it from the Federal aid highway limitations. And why are we doing



that? Because this will make sure that this is over and above whatever they can get in that particular State through the authorization process.

There is no question, this is pure pork, and everybody in this place knows it. And we know that the gentleman in question has said that he is going to bring \$1 billion home to his State. And what do we do? Like sheep, we let him lead us right down the road to a \$1 billion slaughter. And I want to tell Members, the gentleman said anybody that takes issue with him might just as well get on a slide and slide down the hill into the Potomac for opposing him. Well, I suppose that is my destiny, to slide down that slide into the Potomac.

But I want to tell Members that the taxpayers of this country are tired of us wasting their money, and this is \$148.5 million of pure, unadulterated pork.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Let me say in regard to what this money is for, it is for completion of the Appalachian highway corridor system, of which 70 percent is already complete in this Nation. It is a program that is many decades, years old, and the original purpose of this program was to help those in isolated, poverty-stricken regions of this Nation, not to provide them a hand-out, but to help them pull themselves up out of the poverty in which they are mired. The job is not yet done. This particular corridor G that runs through southern West Virginia is a project that is very near its completion point, and this is to complete that corridor.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I understand that.

Mr. RAHALL. Opening up people to jobs and opportunities, business opportunities.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I may reclaim my time and say, if it is that important, if it is that big a priority, then why did it not go through the highway authorization bill, No. 1? And No. 2, why is there this language in here that says that these funds are exempted from many limitations on obligations to the Federal aid highways and highway safety construction programs? They are going outside the system to get this money.

Mr. RAHALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. I would say to the gentleman because this particular highway program is not under the Department of Transportation. The Appalachian corridor system was separated from the normal transportation highways

back during the Reagan years when an effort was made to abolish the program completely. So we had to settle for the separation of the two programs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I can reclaim my time, I would just like to say that the fact of the matter is that it still should be in the highway authorization bill where we are going to spend \$7 billion or \$7.5 billion, and not in a special appropriation bill to circumvent the system.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WALKER. If the gentleman will yield, what the gentleman from West Virginia has just told us is that this spending is not germane to this bill and should not even be in here. It is not under the highway and transportation bill, but should be in someplace else. So what we have is, we have spending which is nongermane to the bill. We have \$148.5 million that ought not even be.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and would suggest that I consider the building of highways in this Nation to be transportation-related. In addition, we know the difficulties with getting roads authorized under the highway trust fund as it exists today. The trust fund sits up here with a \$14 million to \$15 million balance. We cannot get projects authorized under the trust fund, because we cannot get an agreement to spend down what is in that trust fund. Therefore, we cannot get authorizations for this or any other projects in an agreement to spend the money under the highway trust fund.

That is the reason for going through this transportation appropriation bill, and this is what this is, a transportation-related issue.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. If I can reclaim my time, let me just say that there is going to be \$6.8 billion to \$7.5 billion spent from the highway trust fund for 450 to 500 projects, and if this is a high priority it should have been in that particular authorization bill instead of circumventing it for one special person who wants to bring \$1 billion home to his State.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I do not think anyone is saying that it is for one special person. As a matter of fact, this is a major coal-hauling road and provides many important benefits by being constructed, and it is 65 percent completed already. The roughest part

still has to be completed, but this is what we depend upon to get energy to the gentleman and to a lot of States in the Northeast for their energy needs.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Then why was it not put in the authorization bill?

Mr. WISE. This road transportation system is not under the regular authorization system, as the gentleman well knows, and has already been explained to him.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. That is begging the issue. It ought to be.

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. The gentleman's agonizing concern about the authorization I would like to lay partially to rest by suggesting that under the Appalachian regional system there is a system of corridor roads which are authorized under that system. This is a continuation of a corridor that has already been considered and been the subject of an authorization in the past, and would not be the subject of an authorization. If the authorization is hanging there, the gentleman may be assured that it has been the subject of authorization and authorized in the past already. This is simply the funding.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. The authorization committee does not have to go through the appropriation process. They can just go ahead and authorize it and the money can be expended for that purpose. So if they have authorized this phase of the project, it would be completed, and it should be prioritized just like everything else in the highway authorization bill.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Absolutely. We agree completely, except that it is authorized under a different program, the Appalachian Regional Commission authorization for the corridor system. It is already authorized and this is the funding for it.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me end this discussion, because I know we have been belaboring it for some time, and we are going to vote in just a minute or two. But let me just say this: I want to go through these facts one more time, and then we will end the debate, and I will not be up here beating on this issue again today. But let me just say that these are the facts: The deficit 10 years ago was \$1 trillion. It took us 200 years to get there. In 10 years we have gone from \$1 trillion to \$4 trillion, \$4 trillion in 10 years.

The deficit last year, after we raised the taxes on the American people by \$137 billion, the second largest tax increase in history, the deficit was supposed to go down, and the deficit is going to be double what we anticipated. It is going to be over \$400 billion this year.

We are paying 18 cents approximately in interest on every dollar that is taken into the Treasury. That is about \$300 billion a year that is going for no good purpose except to pay interest. And that money could be better spent someplace else.

If we do not get control of spending, we are going to see 25 percent of all spending going for interest. We are going to see a \$600 billion or \$700 billion debt in 1 year, debt acquisition in 1 year, and we are going to see a \$6 trillion or \$8 trillion national debt.

□ 1650

This economy is going to go right down the tubes. The worst part of it is the ones who are going to pay for it are the future generations.

When are we going to start being responsible around here? We ought to defeat this motion.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

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

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

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

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 238, nays 186, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 301]

YEAS—238

Abercrombie	Coleman (TX)	Frost
Ackerman	Collins (MI)	Gaydos
Alexander	Conyers	Geddeson
Anderson	Costello	Gephardt
Annunzio	Coughlin	Geren
Anthony	Cox (IL)	Gibbons
Applegate	Coyne	Gillmor
Aspin	Darden	Gonzalez
Atkins	Davis	Gordon
AuCoin	de la Garza	Green
Bacchus	DeFazio	Guarini
Bateman	DeLauro	Hall (OH)
Bennett	Dellums	Hamilton
Bereuter	Dicks	Harris
Berman	Dingell	Hatcher
Bevill	Dixon	Hayes (IL)
Bilbray	Donnelly	Hayes (LA)
Bonior	Downey	Hefner
Borski	Durbin	Hertel
Boucher	Dymally	Hoagland
Boxer	Early	Hochbrueckner
Brooks	Edwards (CA)	Horn
Browder	Edwards (TX)	Horton
Brown	Engel	Houghton
Bruce	Erdreich	Hoyer
Bryant	Espy	Hubbard
Bustamante	Evans	Jefferson
Byron	Fascell	Jenkins
Campbell (CO)	Fazio	Johnson (SD)
Cardin	Feighan	Johnson
Carr	Flake	Jones (GA)
Chapman	Foglietta	Jones (NC)
Clay	Ford (MI)	Jontz
Clement	Ford (TN)	Kanjorski
Clinger	Frank (MA)	Kaptur

Kennedy	Mrazek	Serrano
Kennelly	Murphy	Sharp
Kildee	Murtha	Shaw
Kleccka	Myers	Shuster
Kolter	Nagle	Sikorski
Kopetski	Natcher	Sisisky
Kostmayer	Neal (MA)	Skaggs
LaFalce	Nowak	Skeen
Lancaster	Oakar	Skelton
Lantos	Oberstar	Slaughter (NY)
LaRocco	Obey	Smith (FL)
Laughlin	Olin	Smith (IA)
Lehman (CA)	Oliver	Solarz
Lehman (FL)	Ortiz	Spence
Levin (MI)	Owens (NY)	Spratt
Levine (CA)	Owens (UT)	Staggers
Lewis (CA)	Pastor	Stallings
Lewis (GA)	Patterson	Stark
Lightfoot	Payne (NJ)	Stokes
Lipinski	Payne (VA)	Studds
Lloyd	Pelosi	Swift
Long	Perkins	Thomas (GA)
Lowery (CA)	Pickett	Thornton
Lowey (NY)	Pickle	Torres
Manton	Poshard	Torricelli
Markey	Price	Towns
Marlenee	Quillen	Trafficant
Martinez	Rahall	Traxler
Matsui	Ravenel	Unsold
Mavroules	Regula	Vento
Mazzoli	Richardson	Visclosky
McCloskey	Ridge	Volkmer
McDade	Roe	Waters
McDermott	Rogers	Waxman
McEwen	Rose	Weiss
McGrath	Rostenkowski	Wheat
McHugh	Rowland	Whitten
McMillen (MD)	Roybal	Williams
McNulty	Russo	Wise
Miller (CA)	Sabo	Wolpe
Mineta	Sangmeister	Yates
Mink	Savage	Yatron
Moakley	Sawyer	Young (AK)
Mollohan	Scheuer	
Montgomery	Schumer	

NAYS—186

Allard	Fawell	McCandless
Andrews (ME)	Fields	McCollum
Andrews (NJ)	Fish	McCrery
Andrews (TX)	Franks (CT)	McCurdy
Archer	Galleghy	McMillan (NC)
Armey	Gallo	Meyers
Baker	Gekas	Mfume
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Michel
Barrett	Gilman	Miller (OH)
Barton	Gingrich	Miller (WA)
Bellenson	Glickman	Molinar
Bentley	Goodling	Moody
Bilirakis	Goss	Moorhead
Bliley	Gradison	Moran
Boehert	Grandy	Morella
Boehner	Gunderson	Morrison
Brewster	Hall (TX)	Neal (NC)
Bunning	Hammerschmidt	Nichols
Burton	Hancock	Nussle
Callahan	Hansen	Orton
Camp	Hastert	Oxley
Campbell (CA)	Hefley	Packard
Carper	Henry	Pallone
Chandler	Herger	Panetta
Coble	Hobson	Parker
Coleman (MO)	Huckaby	Paxon
Combest	Hughes	Pease
Condit	Hunter	Penny
Cooper	Hutto	Peterson (FL)
Cox (CA)	Hyde	Peterson (MN)
Cramer	Inhofe	Petri
Crane	Ireland	Porter
Cunningham	Jacobs	Pursell
Dannemeyer	James	Ramstad
DeLay	Johnson (CT)	Ray
Derrick	Johnson (TX)	Reed
Dickinson	Kasich	Rhodes
Dooley	Klug	Riggs
Doolittle	Kolbe	Rinaldo
Dorgan (ND)	Kyl	Ritter
Dorman (CA)	Lagomarsino	Roberts
Dreier	Leach	Roemer
Duncan	Lent	Rohrabacher
Eckart	Lewis (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen
Edwards (OK)	Livingston	Roth
Emerson	Luken	Roukema
English	Machtley	Sanders
	Martin	Santor

Sarpalius	Solomon	Upton
Saxton	Stearns	Valentine
Schaefer	Stenholm	Vander Jagt
Schiff	Stump	Vucanovich
Schroeder	Sundquist	Walker
Schulze	Swett	Walsh
Sensenbrenner	Synar	Weber
Shays	Tallon	Weldon
Slattery	Tanner	Wolf
Slaughter (VA)	Tauzin	Wyden
Smith (NJ)	Taylor (MS)	Wylie
Smith (OR)	Taylor (NC)	Young (FL)
Smith (TX)	Thomas (CA)	Zeliff
Snowe	Thomas (WY)	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—9

Barnard	Dwyer	Rangel
Broomfield	Holloway	Washington
Collins (IL)	Hopkins	Wilson

□ 1713

Messrs. JACOBS, DOOLEY, SYNAR, WYDEN, CRAMER, HUNTER, DELAY, ECKART, HUGHES, and DICKINSON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. WEISS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAVROULES). The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 69: Page 27, after line 5, insert:

CORNING BYPASS SAFETY DEMONSTRATION PROJECT

For the purpose of continuing a demonstration of traffic safety and flow improvement, there is hereby appropriated \$14,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all funds appropriated under this head shall be exempted from any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$12,600,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 70: Page 27, after line 5, insert:

TURQUOISE TRAIL PROJECT

For necessary expenses to carry out a demonstration project known as the Turquoise Trail project, that demonstrates methods of enhancing safety and promoting economic development through converting a dirt roadway into an all weather, two lane highway, there is hereby appropriated \$3,000,000,



to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such sums appropriated under this head shall be exempted from any limitation obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$2,700,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 71: Page 27, after line 5, insert:

#### OTTUMWA ROAD EXTENSION PROJECT

For the purpose of carrying out a demonstration of economic growth and development benefits of a four lane highway in areas with industry producing heavy traffic, there is hereby appropriated \$8,000,000 to remain available until expended, for the acquisition of rights-of-way, and other costs incurred in the upgrading and construction of a portion of a four lane facility between Prairie City and Ottumwa along existing State highways and new highway alignments: *Provided*, That all funds appropriated under this head shall be exempted from any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$7,200,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 72: Page 27, after line 5, insert:

#### NORTH CAROLINA CONNECTOR PROJECT

For necessary expenses to carry out site selection, preliminary engineering and design work related to construction of a new four-lane highway at interstate standards from Rocky Mount, North Carolina, to Elizabeth City, North Carolina, including extensions to Raleigh, North Carolina, and Portsmouth, Virginia, there is hereby appropriated \$6,000,000 to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That all funds appropriated under this head shall be exempted from any limitation on obligations for Federal-aid highways and highway safety construction programs.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert: "\$4,800,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 73: Page 27, strike out lines 8 to 14.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

#### OPERATIONS AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of the Secretary with respect to traffic and highway safety under the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act (Public Law 92-513, as amended) and the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act, \$78,528,000, to remain available until September 30, 1994.

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 84: Page 30, line 22, strike out "\$14,713,000" and insert "\$10,526,000".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "\$22,331,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 86: Page 31, after line 2, insert:

#### MAGNETIC LEVITATION TRANSPORTATION

(LIQUIDATION OF CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION)  
(LIMITATION ON OBLIGATIONS)  
(HIGHWAY TRUST FUND)

For payment of obligations incurred in carrying out the provisions of a Magnetic Levitation Transportation Program, \$30,000,000, to be derived from the Highway Trust Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds in this Act shall be available for the implementation or execution of programs the obligations for which are in excess of \$30,000,000 for magnetic levitation and high speed rail transportation for fiscal year 1992: *Provided further*, That \$5,000,000 is available until expended for grants to specific States to conduct detailed market analysis of potential maglev and/or high speed rail ridership and determine the availability of rights-of-way for maglev and/or high speed rail use: *Provided further*, That any such grant shall be matched on a dollar for dollar basis by a State, local, or other non-Federal concern.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

Of the funds provided under this head, \$25,000,000 is available until expended for

grants to specific states to conduct detailed market analysis of potential maglev and/or high speed rail ridership and determine the availability of rights-of-way for maglev and/or high speed rail use: *Provided*, That any such grant shall be matched on a dollar for dollar basis by a State, local, or other non-Federal concern.

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 104: Page 36, after line 15, insert:

#### DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.), \$775,000,000 to remain available until expended.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 104 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

#### DISCRETIONARY GRANTS

None of the funds provided in fiscal year 1992 to carry out the provisions of section 3 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended (49 U.S.C. 1601 et seq.) shall be used for the study, design, engineering, construction or other activities related to the monorail segment of the Houston metro program.

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 112: Page 38, after line 22, insert:

#### HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SAFETY

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of Hazardous Materials Safety and

for expenses for conducting research and development, \$12,301,000, of which \$1,302,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, and for reports publication and dissemination: *Provided further*, That not less than \$1,900,000 in fees shall be collected under section 106(c)(11) of the Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act of 1990 (49 App. U.S.C. 1805(c)(11)) and deposited in the general fund of the Treasury as offsetting receipts.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment, insert "\$12,000,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 114: Page 38, after line 22, insert:

#### EMERGENCY TRANSPORTATION

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of Emergency Transportation and for expenses for conducting research and development, \$944,000, of which \$90,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, and for reports publication and dissemination.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 114 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment, insert "\$927,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 115: Page 38, after line 22, insert:

#### RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of Research and Technology and for expenses for conducting research and development, \$1,868,000, of which \$702,000 shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, and for reports publication and dissemination.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment, insert "\$1,516,000".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 116: Page 38, after line 22, insert:

#### PROGRAM AND ADMINISTRATIVE SUPPORT

For expenses necessary to discharge the functions of Program and Administrative Support, \$5,606,000, of which \$165,000 shall be derived from the Pipeline Safety Fund: *Provided*, That there may be credited to this appropriation funds received from the States, counties, municipalities, other public authorities, and private sources for expenses incurred for training, and for reports publication and dissemination: *Provided further*, That no employees other than those compensated under the appropriation shall serve in the Office of the Administrator, the Office of Policy and Programs, the Office of Civil Rights, the Office of Management and Administration, and the Office of the Chief Counsel.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the first sum named in said amendment, insert "\$5,428,000".



Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 125: Page 47, line 14, after "program" insert ", the intelligent vehicle-highway systems program, the magnetic levitation transportation program".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 125 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: ", the strategic highway research program, the intelligent vehicle-highway systems program".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 128: Page 53, strike out all after line 7 over to and including line 2 on page 54.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 128 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows:

SEC. 325. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall, with regard to the Discretionary Grants program of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration, by February 14, 1992, enter into a full funding grant agreement with the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon (Tri-Met) for the construction of the locally preferred alternative for the Westside Light Rail Project, including systems related costs, as defined in Public Law 101-516. That full funding agreement shall provide for a fu-

ture amendment under the same terms and conditions set forth above, for the extension known as the Hillsboro project which extends from S.W. 185th Avenue to the Transit Center in the city of Hillsboro, Oregon. Subject to a regional decision documented in the Hillsboro project's preferred alternatives report, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Tri-County Metropolitan Transportation District of Oregon to initiate preliminary engineering on the Hillsboro project, which shall proceed independent of and concurrent with the project between downtown Portland, Oregon and S.W. 185th Avenue.

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 133: Page 55, strike out lines 9 to 25.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken by said amendment, amended as follows:

SEC. 330. SOUTH BOSTON PIERS TRANSITWAY.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall, with regard to the Discretionary Grants program of the Urban Mass Transportation Administration—

(a) issue a letter of no prejudice, effective as of or retroactive to October 1, 1991, for preliminary engineering and final design, and enter into a full funding agreement, including system related costs, by June 1, 1992, for the portion of the South Boston Piers Transitway Project between South Station and the Portal at D Street in South Boston, Massachusetts. That full funding agreement shall provide for a future amendment under the same terms and conditions set forth above, for the extension of the Transitway from South Station to Boylston Station; and

(b) issue a letter of intent by September 30, 1992, for the extension of the Transitway from South Station to Boylston Station.

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 134, 138, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, and 153 be printed in the RECORD and considered en bloc.

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

There was no objection.

The texts of the amendments enumerated in the foregoing unanimous-consent request are as follows:

Senate amendment No. 134: Page 55, after line 25, insert:

SEC. 328. None of the funds provided in this Act for Coast Guard Acquisition, Construction and Improvements shall be available for any quarter of any fiscal year beginning after December 31, 1991, unless the Commandant of the Coast Guard first submits a quarterly report to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees on all major Coast Guard acquisition projects including projects executed for the Coast Guard by the United States Navy: *Provided*, That such reports shall include an acquisition schedule, estimated current and future year funding requirements, and a schedule of anticipated obligations and outlays for each major acquisitions project: *Provided further*, That such reports shall rate on a relative scale the cost risk, schedule risk, and technical risk associated with each acquisition project and include a table detailing unobligated balances to date and anticipated unobligated balances at the close of the fiscal year and the close of the following fiscal year should the Administration's pending budget request for the acquisition, construction and improvements account be fully funded.

Senate amendment No. 138: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 332. Notwithstanding section 512 of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982 (49 U.S.C. App. 2211), the Secretary of Transportation shall increase the grant AIP3-19-0004-7 by up to \$141,713.

Senate amendment No. 140: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 334. Section 104(c)(3) of the Aviation Safety and Noise Abatement Act of 1979 (49 U.S.C. 2104(c)(3)) is amended by deleting the word "public" before the word "building".

Senate amendment No. 142: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 336. The Secretary of Transportation shall be authorized to enter into a sole source contract with the Puerto Rico Ports Authority for purposes of constructing an air traffic control tower at Luis Munoz Marin Airport with fiscal year 1991 and fiscal year 1992 appropriations provided under this section: *Provided*, That the Puerto Rico Ports Authority shall procure such construction services consistent with Department of Transportation acquisition regulations, part 1201 et cet, chapter 48 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Senate amendment No. 143: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 337. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Niagara Frontier Transportation Authority may provide transportation services in support of the 1993 World University Games.

Senate amendment No. 144: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 338. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the amounts available to New York State under section 3 of the Urban

Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as amended, such sums as may be necessary shall be made available to Secretary for the purpose of conducting a study of the feasibility and cost of adding air conditioning to Pennsylvania Station in New York City.

Senate amendment No. 145: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 339. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, of the discretionary funds available to the District of Columbia under the Interstate Transfer Grants-Highway Program of the Federal-Aid Highways account of this Act, \$5,000,000 in contract authority and in liquidation of contract authority shall be transferred to the Federal Railroad Administration, which shall make such funds available to Amtrak for the Union Station Parking Project in the District of Columbia.

Senate amendment No. 146: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 340. The Secretary of Transportation shall publish by January 15, 1992, a notice of proposed rulemaking with regard to amending the Federal Motor Carrier Safety regulations to prohibit the use of radar detectors in operating commercial motor vehicles. Such notice shall solicit testimony regarding the safety, economic, and operational aspects of prohibiting radar detectors in commercial operations.

Senate amendment No. 148: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 343. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Federal Aviation Administration may use funds from both the facilities and equipment program and the airport improvement formula grant funds to fund the relocation of an ASR-9 radar facility at Nashville International Airport: *Provided*, That Nashville International Airport may use airport improvement formula grant funds to purchase a VORTAC system for the airport.

Senate amendment No. 149: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 343. (a) The Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration shall conduct an aircraft noise mitigation review, to include that airspace over the States of New York and Connecticut lying within a fifty-five nautical mile radius of LaGuardia Airport:

(1) By November 1, 1991, a plan shall be developed by the Administrator to carry out the aircraft noise mitigation review required by this section.

(2) By January 1, 1992, at least 6 public meetings shall be held, with 3 such meetings to be held in each of the States of New York and Connecticut within the study area.

(3) By May 31, 1992, the Administrator shall identify those actions that would be needed to implement air traffic changes that are determined by the Administrator to be appropriate to reduce the effects of aircraft noise within the study area, and to be consistent with the safe and efficient management of air traffic, as provided in the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, as amended, and shall include those identified actions in the Report to Congress required pursuant to section 9119(c) of Public Law 101-508.

(b) There is hereby established the Metropolitan New York Aircraft Noise Mitigation Committee to review aircraft noise complaints within the study area and advise the Administrator of the locations and boundaries of noise impact areas defined by such complaints. The Committee shall consist of nine members, with three members each from the State of Connecticut, New York, and New Jersey, such members to be ap-

pointed by the Governor of each State. The Committee shall obtain the participation of citizens, community associations, and other public organizations concerned with aircraft noise in the study area, and shall make recommendations to the Administrator regarding the organizations. These recommendations shall be submitted to the Administrator in accordance with the schedule he establishes in the plan required under subsection (a)(1).

(c) This section shall not apply to the Federal Aviation Administration's field testing and evaluation of any new noise abatement departure procedures for Runway Thirteen at LaGuardia Airport. Implementation of new procedures, if appropriate, shall be in accordance with all applicable Federal requirements.

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my appreciation to the conferees for their work in reaching agreement on a directive to the Federal Aviation Administration [FAA] to assess the noise impact on New York and Connecticut of flight patterns developed pursuant to the expanded east coast plan.

The clear intent of this provision is for the FAA to get to the bottom of the noise problems afflicting Westchester County, Fairfield County and other areas of New York and Connecticut. In carrying out this directive, the FAA should look at this problem without blinders on. If the FAA finds that factors beyond the expanded east coast plan are contributing to the terrible noise problems confronting Westchester and Fairfield Counties, the FAA should take immediate action to address those problems as well.

The people of Westchester and Fairfield Counties have suffered for too long. This provision mandates that the FAA tackle this problem and come up with a solution. The conferees have done their job in agreeing to this language. It is time for the FAA to do its job and bring noise relief to New York and Connecticut without delay.

Senate amendment No. 150: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 344. Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this legislation, the Administrator shall issue regulations as may be necessary to carry out Section 316(g) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. App. 1357) as amended. The processing of criminal history record checks contained in section 316(g) shall begin not later than 60 days after the issuance of the final regulations.

Senate amendment No. 153: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 347. The Secretary shall advance emergency relief funds to the State of Washington for the replacement of a bridge on the interstate system damaged by November, 1990 storms notwithstanding the provisions of section 125 of title 23, United States Code: *Provided*, That this provision shall be subject to the Federal Share provisions of section 120, title 23, of the United States Code. The State of Washington shall repay such advances to the extent that a final court judgment declares that damage to such bridges was a result of human error.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the

amendments of the Senate numbered 134, 138, 140, 142, 143, 144, 145, 146, 148, 149, 150, and 153 and concur therein with amendments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 139: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 333. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, payments to the City of Atlantic City relating to the transfer of Atlantic City International Airport shall not be considered airport revenues for the purpose of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 (49 U.S.C. 2201, et seq.).

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 335. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, payments to the City of Atlantic City relating to the transfer of Atlantic City International Airport shall not be considered airport revenues for the purposes of the Airport and Airway Improvement Act of 1982, as amended (49 U.S.C. App. 2201, et seq.).

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 141: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 335. None of the funds contained herein may be used to enforce the series of Airworthiness Directives, commencing with the notice issued on November 28, 1987, regarding cargo fire detection and control in aircraft which (1) are operated solely within the State of Alaska, and (2) operate in a configuration with a passenger and cargo compartment on the main deck, until a thorough safety analysis and an economic impact statement have been completed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and have been submitted to and reviewed by the Committee on Appropriations. However, if the Secretary certifies that clear and convincing evidence exists that such rules should be implemented on an emergency basis to present a clear and present threat to passenger safety, such rules may be implemented on a temporary basis pending the outcome of the safety analysis and economic impact statement.



MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 337. None of the funds contained herein may be used to enforce the series of Airworthiness Directives, commencing with the notice issued on November 28, 1987, regarding cargo fire detection and control in aircraft that (1) are operated solely within the State of Alaska, and (2) operate in a configuration with a passenger and cargo compartment on the main deck, until a thorough safety analysis and an economic impact statement have been completed by the Federal Aviation Administration, and have been submitted to and reviewed by the Committees on Appropriations of the Senate and House of Representatives. However, if the Secretary certifies that clear and convincing evidence exists that such rules should be implemented on an emergency basis to prevent a clear and present threat to passenger safety, such rules may be implemented on a temporary basis pending the outcome of the safety analysis and economic impact statement.

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

□ 1720

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 147: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 341. Section 402 of Public Law 97-102 is amended by inserting immediately before the colon, a comma and the following: "except that exempt abandonments and discontinuances that are effectuated pursuant to section 1152.50 of title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations shall not apply toward such 350-mile limit".

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 147 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 343. Section 402 of Public Law 97-102 is amended by inserting immediately before the colon a comma and the following: "except that exempt abandonments and discontinuances that are effectuated pursuant to section 1152.50 of title 49 of the Code of Federal Regulations after the date of enactment of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992, shall not apply toward such 350-mile limit".

tation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1992, shall not apply toward such 350-mile limit".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 152: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 346. None of the funds provided, or otherwise made available, by this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Transportation or the Federal Aviation Administration to consolidate Flight Service Stations (including changes in Flight Service Station operations such as permanent reductions in staff, hours of operation, airspace, and airport jurisdictions and the disconnection of telephone lines), until after the expiration of the 12-month period following the date of the submission to Congress of the Auxiliary Flight Service Station plan required under section 330 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-516; 104 Stat. 2184). This section shall not apply to Flight Service Stations in Laramie, Rawlins, and Rock Springs, Wyoming.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 152 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 347. None of the funds provided, or otherwise made available, by this Act shall be used by the Secretary of Transportation or the Federal Aviation Administration to consolidate flight service stations (including changes in flight service station operations such as permanent reductions in staff, hours of operation, airspace, and airport jurisdictions and the disconnection of telephone lines), until after the expiration of the 9-month period following the date of the submission to Congress of the Auxiliary Flight Service Station plan required under section 330 of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1991 (Public Law 101-516; 104 Stat. 2184). This section shall not apply to flight service stations in Laramie, Rawlins, and Rock Springs, Wyoming.

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the next amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 154: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

SEC. 348. At the end of the first sentence of section 9308(d) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, Public Law 101-508, delete the period and insert the following: "Provided, however, That no air carrier may operate within the State of Hawaii a greater number of Stage 2 aircraft weighing more than 75,000 lbs. than were operated, owned, or leased, by such air carrier as of the date of enactment of this Act. With respect to operations within the State of Hawaii, this subsection shall apply only to those air carriers operating turnaround service with aircraft weighing more than 75,000 lbs. within the State of Hawaii as of the date of enactment of this Act and these same limitations shall also apply to air transportation to and from the State of Hawaii."

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA  
Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 349. (a) Section 9308(d) of Public Law 101-508 is amended by striking the word "This" at the beginning of the first sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following—"Except for Hawaiian operations described in and provided for in subsection (i), this"

(b) Section 9308 of Public Law 101-508 is amended by adding a new subsection (i), to read as follows—

"(i) HAWAIIAN OPERATIONS.—

(1) (A) An air carrier or foreign air carrier may not operate within the State of Hawaii or between a point in the State of Hawaii and a point outside the 48 contiguous States a greater number of Stage 2 aircraft having a maximum weight of more than 75,000 pounds than it operated within the State of Hawaii or between a point in the State of Hawaii and a point outside the 48 contiguous states on November 5, 1990.

(B) An air carrier that provided turnaround service within the State of Hawaii on November 5, 1990, using Stage 2 aircraft having a maximum weight of more than 75,000 pounds may include within the number of aircraft authorized under subparagraph (A) all such aircraft owned or leased by that carrier on such date, whether or not such aircraft were then operated by that carrier.

(2) An air carrier may not provide turnaround service within the State of Hawaii using Stage 2 aircraft having a maximum weight of more than 75,000 pounds unless that carrier provided such service on November 5, 1990.

(3) For the purpose of this subsection, 'turnaround service' means the operation of a flight between two or more points, all of which are within the State of Hawaii."

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the last amendment in disagreement.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Senate amendment No. 157: Page 63, after line 17, insert:

**SEC. 351. FEDERAL GAS TAXES SHOULD NOT BE INCREASED.**

(a) Findings.—The Senate finds that—

(1) many sectors of the Nation's economy have yet to recover from the recent economic downturn;

(2) a tax increase would reduce personal consumption, considered to be the engine of the American economy, and an increase in gasoline and diesel fuel taxes would seriously hinder economic recovery;

(3) an increase in the Federal excise tax on motor fuels by five cents per gallon would further damage the economy in that such an increase would—

(A) increase the Consumer Price Index by 0.2 percent,

(B) imperil the current trend towards economic recovery,

(C) reduce America's potential for growth in the Gross National Product in the near term by \$11,000,000, and

(D) reduce urgently needed job creation by 234,000 job opportunities in the first year;

(4) Federal, State, and local taxes account for nearly 30 percent of the retail price of gasoline;

(5) all States already tax gasoline, and twenty States in the last two years have increased, or considered increasing, their taxes on gasoline; and

(6) gasoline and diesel fuel excise taxes are the most regressive forms of taxation, in that less affluent Americans must spend a greater proportion of their income to pay those taxes than do more affluent Americans.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that, in light of the current economic conditions, the Federal excise taxes on gasoline and diesel fuel should not be increased.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. LEHMAN OF FLORIDA

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEHMAN of Florida moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157 and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

SEC. 351. (a) Notwithstanding any other law, the Secretary of Transportation shall construe all references in this Act to Title 23, the Urban Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1964 as amended, and the Federal-Aid Highway Acts in a manner which continues to apply such references to the appropriate programs as may be authorized by a subsequent surface transportation assistance act.

(b) Section 329(a) of the Department of Transportation and Related Agencies Approp-

riations Act, 1988, Public Law 100-102, is amended by striking "and 1991" and inserting "1991, and 1992".

Mr. COUGHLIN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEHMAN].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

**DECENNIAL CENSUS IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1991**

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 3280) to provide for a study, to be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences, on how the Government can improve the decennial census of population, and on related matters, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Senate amendments:

Page 2, line 3, after "Act," insert "and subject to the availability of appropriations,".

Page 3, line 2, strike out "refinement of population data; and" and insert "refinement of population data, including a review of the accuracy of the data for different levels of geography (such as States, places, census tracts and census blocks); and".

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LEWIS of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to have, if we could, a little more explanation of what we are about to do here.

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

Mr. ARCHER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I would be pleased to take this time to explain briefly the purpose of the Decennial Census Improvement Act of 1991 and to talk about the amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation authorizes a study by the National Academy of Sciences about ways to improve the accuracy of the 2000 census and to meet the data needs of the Nation.

The bill requires the Commerce Department to enter into a contract with

the Academy within 30 days of enactment. The Academy will issue an interim report within 18 months, with a final report within 3 years.

The two amendments that were offered in the Senate are clarifying in nature. The first provides that implementation of this legislation is subject to the availability of sufficient appropriations.

The second amendment clarifies that the Academy should review data accuracy at different levels of geography, including census tracts and blocks, when considering the use of sampling methods.

The Academy is widely respected for its expertise in the census and other Federal statistical issues. It is well positioned to conduct an objective, comprehensive review of census methods.

The Academy estimates that the study will cost \$1.4 million. That amount of money was set aside for this study in the fiscal year 1992 commerce, justice, State, and judiciary appropriations bill.

On September 30, the House unanimously passed this measure, and I would urge the support of my colleagues in taking final action on this bill today.

With an early and comprehensive planning effort, we have a fighting chance for a markedly improved census process and more accurate results in the year 2000 and beyond.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I guess I would like to take just a moment to recognize the significant efforts of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE] who is the ranking member of our subcommittee and whose contribution to this legislation really made it a collaborative effort, and to acknowledge the strong support and invaluable assistance of the committee chairman, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLAY], as well as the efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the committee's ranking minority member.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER] for his explanation.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3280, the Decennial Census Improvement Act of 1991 as amended by the Senate.

The timing is now critical for addressing the year 2000 planning for the census. H.R. 3280 as amended would authorize a study by the National Academy of Sciences on improving the accuracy of the decennial census in the year 2000.

Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that we recognize the mistakes of the 1990 decennial process and take the necessary steps to not repeat what happened. It is incumbent on all of us to explore new methodologies and new approaches for the census enumeration.

H.R. 3280 would provide an objective, independent review of our national data needs and methods to achieve an accurate census in the year 2000.



Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, Mr. SAWYER, and the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RIDGE], for their outstanding leadership and commitment to their oversight responsibilities over the census and for expeditiously moving this important measure through the legislative process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on the bill H.R. 3280 and the Senate amendments thereto.

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

There was no objection.

#### NATIONAL LAW ENFORCEMENT MEMORIAL DEDICATION DAY

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 107) to designate October 15, 1991, as "National Law Enforcement Memorial Dedication Day," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate Joint Resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of Senate Joint Resolution 107, which designates October 15, 1991 as National Law Enforcement Memorial Day. And I would like to take this opportunity to commend my colleague and good friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], for his hard work and dedication to our Nation's law enforcement officers.

Over 1,500 law enforcement officers have died in the line of duty in the United States over the past 10 years. That number is shocking.

President Bush has continually reiterated his tough stand against crime and has submitted to the Congress a very serious and worthy proposal to address our Nation's crime problem.

I strongly believe that we must address this serious problem from all angles. Not only do we need more prison space, we need tougher sentences for drug dealers, and for criminals who use guns.

On a more positive note, this year's National Law Enforcement Memorial Day is particularly significant. The dream of a National Law Enforcement Officer's Memorial will soon be a reality.

The many years of planning and construction are now complete, and the final opening ceremony is set for this month.

The Law Enforcement Officer's Memorial, located nearby at Judiciary Square, will honor the men and women who have given their lives in the line of duty.

This memorial will also pay tribute to the service and sacrifice of all those who serve.

I would like to commend all those who have had a part in making this dream become a reality, especially the many dedicated people of the National Law Enforcement Officer's Memorial Fund.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me today in supporting this important measure and the Law Enforcement Memorial.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of Senate Joint Resolution 107, a bill to designate Tuesday, October 15, 1991, as "National Law Enforcement Memorial Day."

While I am proud to be the author of today's resolution regarding the official dedication of the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial, I am prouder to be able to pay a well-deserved tribute to the man chiefly responsible for this memorial project ever being initiated. I refer to our former colleague and my dear friend Mario Biaggi from New York. Mario was the author of the legislation which established the authority for this memorial to be built. Mario Biaggi initially authored this resolution in 1982 and by 1984 with the overwhelming support of the House the resolution became public law. It was established from the very outset that this memorial would be built entirely with private dollars. Today thanks to the individual contributions of more than 1 million individuals, this memorial becomes a reality on next Tuesday.

As some of my colleagues remember, Mario Biaggi came to this Congress after a most distinguished 23 year career as a police officer in New York City. Mario was at one time the most decorated police officer in the history of New York and his police career was highlighted when he won the Medal of Honor for Bravery. All told, Mario was injured many times in the line of duty including being shot on more than half a dozen occasions.

When Mario Biaggi was elected to the House in 1969, he transformed his career as a cop and became a champion for the rights of law enforcement officers and remained that throughout his 19 years in this body. He was one of the original authors of the legislation which established a first time lump sum death benefit payment for law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. It was initially established at \$50,000 in the first year which was 1976. Ten years later Mario Biaggi came back with new legislation to increase the death benefit to \$100,000 and this too became law.

Mario Biaggi led the successful effort which resulted in the enactment of tough legislation to outlaw armor-piercing ammunition which posed such a grave threat to the safety of law enforcement officers across the country. Mario tenaciously fought all odds in moving this leg-

islation forward through the Congress taking on the very formidable National Rifle Association which opposed his efforts from the outset. Mario Biaggi prevailed in the final instance because his cause was just—his cause was the safety of the more than 500,000 law enforcement officers who faced enough risks in their day-to-day work without the additional and very grave threat posed by these armor-piercing bullets.

Yet from my past and present conversations with Mario, I know that perhaps his proudest legislative achievement in the House was the passage of the resolution creating the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. It was Mario's contention from the outset that the more than 12,000 law enforcement personnel who were killed in the line of duty—were being overlooked with the absence of a national memorial. It seemed to him that these brave American men and women—fighting in the front lines of another kind of war—one fought daily in our streets, at least deserved a place in our Nation's Capital where their sacrifice would be honored in a permanent fashion.

And so it will be on next Tuesday when this beautiful memorial is dedicated by the President at Judiciary Square. It will be a permanent memorial to honor the 12,561 law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty. It is a sad statistic to acknowledge, sadder still to realize that one law enforcement officer is killed every 57 hours in this Nation. Yet this memorial will serve to pay the proper tribute and show the proper respect for the men and women who don the uniform of law enforcement and wage the war against crime for our sake and that of our families.

I wish for my colleagues to know of the important contribution which Mario Biaggi made to this Law Enforcement Officers Memorial. I would also like to salute the president of the Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund Mr. Craig Floyd, who prior to assuming this responsibility served with distinction as legislative assistant to Mario Biaggi. Craig has done an outstanding job in raising the funds and developing the memorial.

I am pleased to note that Mario Biaggi will be there for the dedication of the memorial as will many members of his family. It will be a proud moment for him and for those of us who know what his leadership has meant to the law enforcement community of this Nation—we will share his pride.

The Clerk read the Senate joint resolution, as follows:

#### S.J. RES. 107

Whereas each day over 500,000 law enforcement officers place their lives at risk in order to maintain law and order in society and apprehend people who violate Federal, State, and local laws;

Whereas over the last 10 years over 1,500 law enforcement officers have been killed in the line of duty;

Whereas in 1989, 148 law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty and preliminary figures for 1990 indicate that 119 law enforcement officers were killed;

Whereas over 60,000 law enforcement officers are assaulted in the line of duty each year, resulting in over 20,000 injuries; and

Whereas the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial was established by an Act of Congress in 1984, and the memorial is scheduled for completion at Judiciary

Square in Washington, District of Columbia in October 1991: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That October 15, 1991, is designated as "National Law Enforcement Memorial Dedication Day" and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating October 15, 1991, as "National Law Enforcement Memorial Dedication Day".

The Senate joint resolution 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.

#### NATIONAL PUBLIC SAFETY TELECOMMUNICATORS WEEK

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 284) to designate the second week in April as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, every day, in all of our communities, dedicated public safety telecommunicators answer our calls for assistance. They dispatch our calls for help to local police and fire departments, facilitating the execution of emergency rescue and law-enforcement operations in all of our districts. These public safety personnel serve as the vital links within our cities and towns, although rarely appreciated because they are not physically at the scene.

The Nation's public safety telecommunicators also work to improve emergency response capabilities through their leadership in training programs provided by the Associated Public-Safety Communications Officers. APCO is an association of nearly 9,000 people engaged in the operation, design, and installation of emergency response communications systems for Federal, State and local government agencies.

It is time that we show our appreciation for these people who make our Nation's police and fire departments professional and responsive. In order to recognize the high-quality communications services provided by police and fire dispatchers, 911 operators, and emergency medical technicians, I have sponsored House Joint Resolution 284, to designate the week beginning April 12, 1992, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] for her assistance in bringing this resolution to the floor today. She and her staff have worked diligently and with great distinction. I also want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania and chairman of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus [Mr. WELDON], for his leadership and support.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as the Republican sponsor of House Joint Resolution

284, and as a member of the Congressional Fire Services Caucus, it is my pleasure to rise in support of this legislation to designate the second week of April 1992, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week."

Public safety telecommunicators are the driving force behind our Nation's emergency rescue services. They are the men and women who dispatch our police forces, our ambulances, our firefighters. Although they are not as visible as the men and women who arrive at the scene of emergencies, they are just as important.

We depend upon public safety telecommunicators to notify emergency personnel promptly, clearly, and calmly. We depend upon them to keep our husbands, our wives, and our children calm and assured in an emergency. We depend upon them for guidance and support in our most frantic and panicked moments.

Mr. Speaker, some of us have been lucky enough not to have had to dial 911 in the middle of a fire, a robbery, or a medical emergency. But for the millions of Americans who have faced such an emergency, public safety telecommunicators have been there—ready and willing to help. It is, indeed, fitting that we take time to recognize their invaluable contribution to our daily lives, and I am very pleased to support the designation of the second week of April 1992, as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week."

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

#### H.J. RES. 284

Whereas over one-half million dedicated men and women are engaged in the operation of emergency response systems for Federal, State, and local governmental entities throughout the United States;

Whereas these individuals are responsible for responding to the telephone calls of the general public for police, fire, and emergency medical assistance and for dispatching said assistance to help save the lives and property of our citizens;

Whereas such calls include not only policy, fire, and emergency medical service calls but those governmental communications related to forestry and conservation operations, highway safety and maintenance activities, and all of the other operations which the modern governmental agency must conduct; and

Whereas America's public safety telecommunicators daily serve the public in countless ways without due recognition by the beneficiaries of their services: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the second week in April is hereby designated as "National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week". The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

#### AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. SAWYER: Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the week beginning April 12, 1992, is designated as "National Public Safety

Telecommunicators Week", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SAWYER].

The amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

#### TITLE AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SAWYER

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title amendment offered by Mr. SAWYER: Amend the title so as to read: "To designate the week beginning April 12, 1992, as 'National Public Safety Telecommunicators Week'."

The title amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### ITALIAN-AMERICAN HERITAGE AND CULTURE MONTH

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service be discharged from further consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 260) designating October 1991 as "Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month" and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

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

□ 1730

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am pleased to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 260, legislation to designate October 1991 as Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month. I am pleased to have cosponsored this legislation and wish to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. ENGEL] for his sponsorship of this legislation.

Italian-Americans in the United States represent one of the largest ethnic groups in our Nation. With 20 million Americans of Italian descent it would be difficult, if not impossible, to name the many contributions they have made to the formation and development of our great Nation.

Perhaps the greatest contribution made by an Italian will be celebrated next year. Of course, I am speaking about the 500th anniversary of the discovery of America by Christopher Columbus.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to rise in support of House Joint Resolution 260, and I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.



The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 260

Whereas Italians and Italian-Americans have contributed to the United States in all aspects of life, including art, science, civil service, military service, athletics, education, law, and politics;

Whereas Italian-Americans make up one of the largest ethnic groups in the United States;

Whereas, in recognition of the accomplishments of Christopher Columbus, recognized as one of the greatest explorers in world history and the first to record the discovery of the Americas, a national observance day was established in October of every year;

Whereas the phrase in the Declaration of Independence "All men are created equal", was suggested by the Italian patriot and immigrant Philip Mazzei;

Whereas the people of the United States take great pride in the accomplishments of the many outstanding men and women of Italian descent who have enriched our Nation's history such as Fiorello La Guardia, the beloved Mayor of New York City, and Enrico Fermi, who won the 1938 Nobel Prize in Physics;

Whereas Italy enjoys a rich cultural heritage and has given the world the great works of Dante, the breathtaking art of Giotto and Michelangelo, and the inspirational music of Antonio Vivaldi and Domenico Scarlatti;

Whereas the Americas were named after the Italian explorer Amerigo Vespucci;

Whereas Giuseppe Verdi, one of the world's most renowned opera composers, was born October 10, 1813;

Whereas William Paca, an Italian-American, was one of the signers of the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas during October 1991 special attention will be directed at National, State, and local programs that promote Italian heritage and culture: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That October 1991 is designated as "Italian-American Heritage and Culture Month", and the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation calling upon the people of the United States to observe such month with appropriate ceremonies and activities.*

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the joint resolutions just considered and passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Ways and Means has had sequential referral of the crime bill. There is a question of whether we have until midnight tonight without asking unanimous consent to file, or whether we must ask unanimous consent to file beyond the adjournment of the House today, but before midnight tonight.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that on the last day of a sequential referral, the committee has until midnight to file its report.

#### HUNTING AND FIREARMS ARE A TRADITION AND A HERITAGE

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

Mr. MARLENEE. Mr. Speaker, hunting and firearms are a tradition and a heritage with a tremendous number of Americans.

This tradition has contributed to record numbers of wildlife. It has contributed to millions of acres of habitation. But just as importantly, it has contributed immensely to the social fabric of America.

There is an element in America that would, through its networking, destroy our heritage and our traditions. These groups are tied closely together and would eliminate our firearms, our hunting, and our sportsmen.

One columnist from Alaska, Wayne Anthony Ross, put it in perspective on September 8, 1991, in the Anchorage Times. I include his article with my remarks.

[From the Anchorage Times, Sept. 8, 1991]

LESSON IN HUNTING NOT JUST ABOUT KILLING, BUT CONCERNS LIFE ITSELF

(By Wayne Anthony Ross)

I have handwritten this column on a paper plate, for I have no notepaper. It is 8 p.m. and the Talkeetna Mountains reflect the setting sun. Barb will carry this column to town tomorrow after the air taxi comes to get her and the kids. I will stay here a bit longer, but I will miss them.

We came, ostensibly, for our annual moose hunt. Last year this area was closed. The moose here (if there are any moose here) haven't been hunted in two years so, theoretically, hunting should be good.

If hunting success were only measured in shooting the animal, our hunt would be considered a failure. Not only have we not gotten a moose, but we haven't even seen a moose. In fact, we haven't even seen any sign of moose.

This was to be Amy's year. She's 13 and though she's been hunting since she was 6, she has yet to get her first big game animal. Tim, 15, shot his first moose when he was 8, and he and I agreed that this year Amy would get the first shot.

Unfortunately, the plane comes tomorrow and it doesn't look like there will be a first shot.

I face this realization with a mixture of sorrow and relief. Sorrow because, once again, the moose meat we all enjoy, won't be in our freezer. And sorrow because Amy still has not experienced the joy and self-satisfaction of getting an animal big enough to feed her family throughout the year.

Yet, dare I confess it, there is also relief. My two best packers are off to college. Thus, if Amy did get a moose, old Dad would play a major role in getting it out of the woods. As I near the half-century mark, the prospect of hauling hundreds of pounds of meat across the tundra isn't anticipated with the enthusiasm it once was.

As I followed Amy through the woods, she moved with confidence. I am glad for this time we are together—watching her, with her .30-30 rifle and her .45 pistol, I continued to hope we would see a moose and that she would get the shot. But I did ask the dear Lord to make it fall as close to the canoe as possible.

Now we have returned to the cabin without a moose, yet Amy doesn't seem downhearted. She was there. She participated. She was ready. She gave it her all. It was the moose who failed to cooperate. She seems to know, even at her age, what hunting is all about.

There is no sure thing, no guarantee. Hunting is only the fair attempt to take an animal coupled with the possibility that some day the hunter may succeed. The joy is not dependent on the killing. The joy is in being there. The joy is in the possibility of achieving success.

In teaching our children about hunting, we are also teaching them about life. In learning about hunting, they come to realize that the world doesn't owe them a living. They learn, instead, that to succeed they have to get involved, to participate, to try. Whether they succeed or not is not as important as whether or not they try to succeed.

Still, there's nothing like a little success to encourage a person on to greater effort. Since Amy didn't get a moose this fall, maybe I should take her deer hunting. There's a good chance she'll get one, and finally know the joy of "bringing home the bacon." And let's face it, a deer won't be as difficult for me to pack out of the woods!

#### TRIBUTE TO WESTERN SAMOAN NATIONAL RUGBY TEAM IN THE WORLD CUP FINALS

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend President Bush for graciously inviting to the Oval Office yesterday afternoon the Western Samoa Prime Minister, Hon. Tofilau Eti Alesana, for their first official meeting in the Nation's Capital. Accompanying the Prime Minister to the White House yesterday were the Western Samoa Ambassador to the United States Hon. Tuaepepe Felix Wendt, the Secretary of Foreign Affairs, Hon. Mose Sua, and Western Samoa's Consul General to Auckland, New Zealand, Hon. Fetatai Mata'afa.

Mr. Speaker, it is not very often that I share with my colleagues some of the most important events and problems emanating from our part of the world—

that is the South Pacific region. Other than the concerns expressed for some years about the dangers to the marine environment caused by the continuous French nuclear testing in the Pacific and other important issues affecting our region, our Government continues to remain silent at a time when global environmental issues can no longer be ignored.

Of good note, I want to share with my colleagues an event that took place 3 days ago whereby a tiny Pacific Island nation of Western Samoa, and the smallest country among the 16 nations vying in the World Cup finals, won its first game against an old established rugby team, and world renown, the national rugby team of Wales. Their 16 to 13 win at Cardiff Arms Park headquarters on October 6 marks Western Samoa's first over a member of the International Rugby Board. Mr. Speaker, I agree with Mr. Peter Schuster, the Samoan coach when he told a crowd after the games that "it was the day we have been waiting for, the greatest rugby day for our nation."

The independent state of Western Samoa, with a population of 170,000, have only about 6,000 rugby athletes to select from for its National team.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Mr. Bryan Williams, technical adviser to the Western Samoa team, and a fellow Samoan known throughout the world as one of the greatest rugby players, for bringing Western Samoa rugby to where it is now. He is certainly the backbone and an inspiration to the team and I want to commend him for his great efforts. I would also like to commend Mr. Tate Simi, team manager, Mr. Su'a Peter Schuster, team coach, and Mr. Kasimani Lautusi, team trainer for their hard work and patience.

Mr. Speaker, a Samoan proverbial expression, "e le sili le ta'i i le tapua'i". Translated, it means it is far better to endure than to lead. I want to offer my special commendation to His Highness Tupua Tuiatua, patron and president of the Western Samoa Rugby Union for his perseverance, patience, and leadership in guiding the Union over the last 20 years. I also want to commend the Prime Minister, Hon. Tofilau Eti Alesana and the Minister of Education, Sports and Culture, Hon. Fiamme Naomi Mata'afa for their leadership and support.

I also want to pay tribute to Her Royal Highness Princess Pilolevu Tuita of the Kingdom of Tonga and her husband, His Excellency Taufa Tuita, Tonga's High Commissioner to the United Kingdom who were also in attendance to lend their support.

Mr. Speaker, I also commend Mr. Kuka Molio'o, president of Apia Express Co. in Los Angeles for his tremendous support and assistance.

In addition, I would like to offer my sincere appreciation to the people of

Wales and the city of Cardiff for their kindness and hospitality as host of the World Cup finals, above all, their sportsmanship as shown after their loss to Western Samoa. It reminds me of an expression, "If you don't know how to lose, you don't deserve to win." I would like to say to the people of Wales that they won for their absolute sportsmanship.

Mr. Speaker, above all, I want to congratulate the management and more especially the members of the Western Samoa rugby team called Manu o Samoa for having played a tremendous game against a prominent opponent, the national rugby team of Wales. The players are: Peter Fatialofa, prop/captain; Stan To'omalatai, hooker; Si'u Fanolua, hooker; Vili Alalatoa, prop; Tavita Sio, prop; Mark Birtwistle, lock/loose forward; Eddie Ioane, lock; Mata'afa Keenan, lock; Saini Lemamea, lock/loose forward; Sila Vaifale, loose forward/flanker; Junior Paramore, loose forward/flanker; Apolo Perelini, loose forward/flanker; Tupo Fa'amasino, wing 3/4 fullback; Pat Lam, loose forward No. 8; Danny Keleopa, loose forward No. 8; Mathew Vaea, halfback; Tu Nu'ualiitia, halfback; Stephen Bachop, five eights/vice captain; Filipino Saena, five eights; Keneti Sio, five eights; Frank Bunce, five eights; Pereti Tuilagi; center 3/4; To'o Vaea's, center 3/4; Timo Tagalaoa, wing 3/4; Brian Lima, wing 3/4; and Anetele'a Aiolupo, fullback.

I submit these articles for the RECORD.

[From Today, Oct. 7, 1991]

WALES: SAMOANS IN CUP SENSATION  
(By Roy Collins)

Wales' shocked and wounded players booked into a rehabilitation centre last night after their humiliating defeat by Western Samoa.

The 16-13 defeat against the smallest nation in the World Cup with a population of 170,000—the size of Romford—ranks as one of rugby's biggest upsets.

The Welsh, who must now beat Argentina and joint favourites Australia to be sure of a quarter-final place, lost three players to injury in a ferocious battle at Cardiff Arms Park in which their players literally had their arms torn from their sockets.

Lock Phil May was forced off with a dislocated shoulder, flanker Richie Collins with a badly wrenched one and full back Anthony Clement with a bruised hip.

But that was nothing compared to the bruised pride of the 1987 World Cup semi-finalists.

Beforehand, captain Ieuan Evans said defeat would be: "The end of the world as far as Welshmen are concerned."

Afterwards there were tears, while fears that Wales will have to qualify against the likes of Spain, Holland and Italy for the 1995 World Cup will come true unless they can produce a miracle in their remaining group matches.

It is a massive blow to Welsh pride and massive setback to their revival hopes after the ravaging effects of the defections to rugby league.

Coach Robert Norster added: "We thought when the draw was made that this would be

a tough group and now we face an uphill task to qualify for the next stage.

"We were already booked into a rehabilitation centre in Brecon for the next day or two, which is just as well with our wounded."

Peter Fatialofa, captain of Western Samoa, said: "This is the greatest day in our rugby history."

"To beat Wales at the Arms Park is a moment to cherish."

To add to Wales' frustration, TV clearly showed the first of Samoa's two tries should not have been awarded.

Centre To'o Vaega claimed to have won a race to the line, but it was Welsh scrum half Robert Jones who fell on the ball.

Jones said: "It was very close but I know I definitely got to it first. It's disappointing when a referee makes a mistake like that but you have to accept it."

Victory slashed the Samoans odds to win the World Cup from 250-1 to just 40-1, while sad Wales have rocketed from 66-1 to 250-1.

[From Today, Oct. 7, 1991]

PRIDE GONE: WELSH HOPES LIE IN TATTERS  
(By Roy Collins)

WALES 13, WESTERN SAMOA 16

An hour before the game, the streets around the Arms Park were more silent than chapel as Welsh fans sullenly awaited their fate.

Chapel, the unearthly price of tickets, and the fear or humiliation, were blamed for a disappointing congregation of around 30,000, barely a quorum at a Welsh match, let alone a choirman.

And even some of the faithful showed agnostic tendencies by arriving disguised in Western Samoan scarves.

If ever there was a sporting fixture on which a nation's pride rested, this was it. Wales' national Sunday newspaper implored the 15 boys in red to win it for the country's honour. For the sake of the dragon. For St. David. For Neil Kinnock.

Inside the ground, the fans sat in such morbid silence that, until the late Welsh surge restored the roar to their throats, the only thing you could hear in the stands was the hum of a generator.

Plus, among the neutral fans, a quiet purring at the ferocious tackling and faultless handling of the Western Samoans.

PASSPORTS

Most of them, of course, have as much claim to Western Samoan passports as Zola Budd to a British one, which is why they're known as New Zealand B, the country in which most of them live.

If this, and the apparently falsely awarded first Samoan try piled on the sense of Welsh injustice, it did nothing to detract from the fascination of the impartial observer.

Wales, under house arrest in their own half for most of the first hour, miraculously reached the interval at 3-3, a penalty apiece. By then, though, Phil May had already become the first injury victim of the Samoan tackling and full back Anthony Clement, brutally taken out by Apolo Perelini right on the half-time whistle, was about to follow him.

The Welsh were in such disarray in the first half, second in the tackle and to every loose ball, that captain Ieuan Evans, a few yards from his line, punted straight into the stands.

The pity was that when the inevitable Samoan try arrived early in the second half, it should be one of such dubiousness.

The break from inside their own half was delightful, the kick ahead from To'o Vaega



as mischievous as it was masterful and his race for the line ahead of despairing Welshmen as thrilling as a 100m finish.

Another Welshman, Richie Collins, had been wounded in action and removed from the battlefield by the time Sila Vafale ran in an undisputed second try after a remarkable bout of pressure by the Samoans. A Matthew Vaea penalty stretched the lead to 16-9.

Only then did Wales find the national pride and sheer defiance to deliver a counter, Arthur Emyr driving through to score and set up a fascinating finish to the most absorbing match of the World Cup so far. The wind was back in Welsh sails, the cry back in the fans' throats.

#### WHISTLE

Despite the disputed try, despite the Welsh gameness, victory for them would have been an even greater injustice. As the Western Samoans poetically put it afterwards, this was their day in the rugby sun. And their poetic passing, contrasted to quite savage tackling, earned them their glory.

It was all too much for Phil Davies, the Llanelli No. 8, as the final whistle signalled the darkest hour in Wales' rugby history.

He sank to his haunches near the centre circle as the rest of the players departed, unable for a moment to drag himself to the darkness of the dressing room.

Eventually, a fan walked over and draped a Welsh scarf over his shoulder, like someone laying a wreath at a graveside.

In their despair, the Welsh could draw comfort only from the fact that they hadn't been beaten by the hated English. That hatred, at least, helped to unite them in sorrow.

A poster close to the Arms Park showed a picture of a tearful Gazza with the caption "you'd cry too . . . if you were English."

Last night, though, it was the Welsh who were drowning in their own tears.

[From the London Times, Oct. 7, 1991]

#### CYCLONE FROM THE PACIFIC DEVASTATES WALES

(By David Miller)

Hurricane Samoa struck the South Wales coast yesterday afternoon, leaving a trail of devastation and despair. Estimates vary of the full extent of the damage inflicted. Many were dazed and several needed medical attention. Early-warning forecasts of the force of the hurricane did little to lessen the psychological impact.

There has been nothing like this moment in the history of rugby union. Western Samoa's World Cup defeat of Wales by 16-13 at Cardiff Arms Park shook the game, never mind the Welsh, to its foundations. The walls of the favoured International Rugby Football Board stronghold, the last "private" governing body in international sport along with the R & A, were breached. Samoa took fearsome revenge for being excluded from the first World Cup four years ago, when they were South Pacific champions.

Back home in Apia, where beach rugby is played with a ferocity that is astonishing to any visitor, a 30,000 crowd was watching the match live at the racecourse on five television screens lent by New Zealand TV. There are few people who give a better party than the Samoans, and they will be swaying with joy in their southern fashion for the next few days.

"A pity it was Wales and not England," their one accompanying journalist commented. The Samoans, population 170,000, see the Welsh as a fellow minority people. The

luckless Welsh, for an hour, had not seen much of anything. Though the score was 3-3 at half-time, they were being torn almost limb from limb.

May, Clement and Collins limped from the field; a few others may well voluntarily have wished to join them. The formidable Pita Fatiafalo, Samoa's captain and prop, asked afterwards whether they would save themselves against Australia to ensure victory and quarter-final qualification against Argentina, replied emphatically: "We're saving ourselves from nothing."

Trying to comfort a Welsh colleague, someone had pointed out that ten of the Samoan team are resident in New Zealand, that it was effectively a New Zealand XV. "Time was when we beat the A team," lamented Taffy.

I have seen, occasionally, New Zealand at their hardest, but not even they compared with some of the Samoans on the rampage. These Pacific Islanders, who have the dimension of a medium-sized deep freezer, came in horizontal, waist-high. The Welsh, quite simply, could not take it. For an hour they were overrun in every department; when Emyr, their winger, scored the try that prompted a revival in the last 15 minutes, the Samoans should long before have been out of reach.

Symbolic of the match was the moment of half-time: Clement was prostrate and motionless on the turf, while the massive flanker, Perelini, whose airborne 16-stone tackle arrived at the moment Clement released a pass, walked away unconcerned. "They will hurt a number of people," Ieuan Evans, Wales' captain, said without rancour. "They knocked us back . . . I don't think this is the bottom, it was a better performance than against Australia [the summer slaughter]."

If something in Welsh rugby died on the day they were driven towards having to qualify for the next World Cup, it was as though the public was prepared for the funeral beforehand. The match began with barely a murmur, in the land where rugby is religion.

It was only when defeat began to take the shape of humiliation, at 13-3, that pride surged back into the hitherto maudlin spectators. Where a moment before the applause was for the visitors, now the cry went up for Wales. And Wales responded.

Suddenly, the strength drained from the Samoan front five. The Welsh ran the ball back and forth across the pitch. Emyr scored, Ring converted: 13-9. The hunt was on. Brilliantly, Ring gained 50 yards into touch. The Samoan backs remained steadfast. The powerful Lewis was stopped in his tracks yards from the line by men half his size. Gibbs, agonisingly, fumbled a pass 20 yards out with Samoa broken.

Lima counter-attacked, was halted four yards out; and Vaea kicked the penalty that gave Samoa breathing space. Back came Wales, Davies was smothered again; from the scrum, the ball was played back, out, and Evans went over in the corner. But it was too little, too late, too inferior.

Fatiafalo said they ran out of petrol in the last ten minutes, but "we'll go for broke against Australia". Wales' coach, Norster, said they were going to a rehabilitation centre. That seemed appropriate.

[From the Daily Express, Oct. 7, 1991]

#### WALES HUMILED BY SAMOANS

(By Tony Bodley)

Ieuan Evans, one of the handful of world-class Welsh players, surged over for a try in the first minute of injury time yesterday—but it hardly raised a cheer at the Arms Park.

By then the damage had been done. Wales are back at the bottom of the pile, the sick joke of international rugby.

The Arms Park, scene of former glories, was only half-full at the start but the 30,000 crowd had begun to drift away soon after a grossly illegal try by centre Tu'o Vaega suggested nothing was going right for the Welsh. They are now a second class rugby nation and the team are hiding their shame in a rehabilitation centre in Brecon. The booking was made weeks ago but Welsh rugby is in need of intensive care.

They have been knocked back among the no-hopers for the next World Cup in 1995 when they will have to pre-qualify along with such giants as Czechoslovakia, Tunisia and Poland.

The Welsh were knocked back yards by the all-action Samoans. The islanders were like a squadron of tanks and about as subtle. But they possessed a glittering cavalry among the backs, who ran rings round the Welsh.

Three Welsh injuries confirmed the enormous strength of the Samoan hit-men. Full-back Tony Clement, flanker Richie Collins and lock Phil May all went off with shoulder injuries. Clement was almost cut in half by 21-year-old flanker Apolo Perelini.

The bulldozing tackles threatened to break the body and certainly broke the spirit. More than one Welshman kept only one eye on the ball and the other on the nearest tackler.

The joyous Samoans had never beaten a senior member of the International Board. Now they are set to create mayhem against Argentina on Saturday, although Australia will be a different matter on Wednesday.

The Samoans, set to meet Scotland or Ireland in the quarter-finals, are drawn from a population lower than Cardiff's but their players are hardened in New Zealand.

The warning bells were ringing straight from the kick-off but the Samoans had to wait 18 minutes before they went in front, scrum-half Mathew Vaea kicking a penalty in front of the posts after three Welshmen went over the top trying to stop Vaega.

Mark Ring, not looking fully fit after key-hole surgery on his right knee three weeks ago, levelled four minutes later after an off-side.

But it was cruel luck that gave the Samoans the lead again 36 seconds after half-time. The ubiquitous Vaega kicked ahead over the Welsh line and raced Robert Jones for the touchdown. To everyone in the stadium it appeared that Jones had won the race.

Television later confirmed it but French referee Patrick Robin, 25 yards behind play, gave the try.

Jones said: "It was very close but I definitely got to the ball first. It's disappointing but you have to accept it."

There could be no complaint over the second try 11 minutes later, a breathtaking handling move ending with flanker Sila Vafale striding over the line.

In theory, Wales can still qualify with games against Argentina and Australia. But the bookies know otherwise and Welsh odds have drifted from 66-1 to 250-1.

Wales—Tries: Emyr, Evans. Con: Ring. Pen: Ring.

Western Samoa—Tries: Vaega, Vafale. Con: Vaea. Pen: Vaea (2).

[From the Western Mail, Oct. 7, 1991]

#### SHAMBLES! WALES FACING CUP EXIT

(By John Kennedy)

Wales is on the brink of a humiliating early Rugby World Cup exit.

The 16-13 defeat by unseeded outsiders Western Samoa at Cardiff Arms Park yester-

day left Ieuan Evans's team facing the humbling prospect of failing to qualify for the quarter-finals.

With two Pool 3 matches left to play, against Argentina on Wednesday and cup favorites Australia on Saturday, Wales have to win against the Pumas to stay in the 16-nations tournament.

Defeat under the Arms Park floodlights on Wednesday night would virtually condemn Wales to having to play through the area qualifying rounds for the 1995 tournament—against countries like Italy, Romania, Spain and the Netherlands.

With a win over the Wallabies in five days an extremely long shot, the best Wales could hope for is a three-country tie for the runners-up spot.

That would require Argentina beating Western Samoa on Sunday and then the quarter-finalist place being decided on try count.

Whatever happens, Wales are already the first of the "big guns," the seven senior members of the International Rugby Board, to lose to one of the unseeded countries in World Cup tournaments.

It was yet another black day for the national game in the wake of the disastrous summer tour of Australia that ended in a record 63-6 Test defeat.

Back home they have now won just two of their last 13 internationals at Cardiff Arms Park. Western Samoa joining France (three times), England, Scotland, Ireland, New Zealand and Romania in winning at the ground in the past three years.

This time Wales were put on the road to defeat by a dubious refereeing decision by Frenchman Patrick Robin and the loss of three key players with injury.

"I touched down first," Wales scrum half Robert Jones said of the try awarded to Samoan centre To'o Vaega just seconds after half-time.

"It was close, but my hand got there," Jones added.

Former Welsh rugby full back J P R Williams summed up the post-match mood by saying, "In a word—embarrassing."

Former wing J J Williams said, "It was a shambles. We were outclassed. Western Samoa had far more skill than us."

Embarrassed fans said after the match that Wales were just 20-minute wonders against the Western Samoans.

"If they had played like they did in the last 20 minutes we would have won the game," said Julian Levell, of Cardiff.

Colin Durham, of Cwmfelinfach, said, "The first half was very busy and in the first 10 minutes of the second half we were nowhere in it, but the last 30 minutes were much better."

"If our performance had been that good earlier on I don't think we could have lost."

[From the Western Mail, Oct. 5 1991]

#### WARRIOR WILLIAMS READY FOR BATTLE

Ethnically, Bryan Williams is "part Samoan." For Rugby World Cup—and especially tomorrow lunchtime at the Arms Park—he is Samoan to the last drop of adrenalin pumping up his still hypercompetitive instinct.

The sinuous New Zealand wing of the 1970s, who hunted like a black panther on the prowl, was never on a losing side against Wales in three Arms Park matches. He is doing his best to see that nothing changes.

"No falling off! Drive, drive, drive! Those guys will die for their country," he demanded of the Western Samoan players pounding across the Sophia Gardens turf and

showing no signs of either falling off or relaxing. They willingly worked themselves into a fresh lather of sweat. Then or now, Williams has never looked for the easy way.

"Yeah, the Arms Park was always a ground with very fond memories for me. Brilliant atmosphere. The thing that sticks in the minds of most visiting players is the singing," he said later in the hotel.

"I'll never forget my first international there in 1972. It coincided with the first time a game from Cardiff had gone out to New Zealand on a live telecast.

"We knew our family our friends and the whole country were right there sharing that game with us. It was an occasion which almost drained the emotions.

"It will help that I've been there, also several of the players from our 1988 tour to Wales. The rest know it will be a cauldron and they have a cope with that."

His role with the players who face Wales tomorrow is technical adviser. "That title covers a multitude of sins," grins Williams who, at 40, covers as much ground today as he did 20 years ago in winning 38 caps for the All Blacks.

He is Auckland coach, Samoan coach in partnership with Peter Schuster, a lawyer by profession and a busy family man with four children.

He is not a conventional big name hired hand for these marauding South Pacific islanders. His heart beats for those dots in a vast blue ocean where Western Samoa is home to an estimated 6,000 players.

"My roots go deep there. My father was born in Western Samoa, my mother is part-Samoan, my sister has lived there for 10 years, my grandparents are buried there," he says. His loyalties are firmly anchored.

He fondly weighs up the rugby strengths and weaknesses of a nation that absorbs the game as an extension of life itself. "You see this overwhelming love of rugby everywhere. It is played on village streets, on rough out fields and on the beaches.

"It is a game that is synonymous with the islands. It suits Samoans because they have this marvellous exuberance for running, passing and handling. Their physically aggressive style is part of their nature.

"It is a joy working with them. They are fun. For them, it is sheer enjoyment. They are also disinterested by all the trappings of the modern game, such as the commercialism.

"Back home as coach to Auckland, I work with many of the All Blacks. There is no comparison because those players take it far more seriously.

"My Samoans play an open game that corresponds to their approach to life—let's give it a go, let's run with the ball... that is their philosophy.

"That said, the New Zealand influence is rubbing off on these guys. They are starting to train the same way and respond to the same disciplines."

The years will roll away for Williams as he sends his warriors out onto the turf where he once battled with Gerald, JPR, Gareth, Barry and the rest. He didn't know what it was like to lose an international in those golden '70s for Welsh rugby. He doesn't aim to start now.

[From the Western Mail Sport, Oct. 7, 1991]

#### WALES TRAPPED IN THE "QUICKSANDS"

(By John Kennedy)

WALS 13 PTS—WESTERN SAMOA 16

A decade of neglect came home to roost with the lunchtime vengeance of a horde of vultures at Cardiff Arms Park yesterday.

Time conclusively caught up with Welsh rugby just when it mattered most.

Humiliation for the already emaciated body of the national game came on the greatest stage of them all.

The Arms Park may not have been full, but the millions of eyes of the Rugby World Cup watching audience witnessed Welsh rugby plumb new depth.

But if those 80 minutes were the final live transmission proof of the alarming decline of the national game, the causes stretch back lot further in time.

To the time when Wales thought the conveyor belt would simply carry on rolling out the ready made world class goods without any oiling of the wheels.

No matter how often or how painful the lessons handed out by the likes of Australia and New Zealand, on and off the field, time stood still for Wales.

While the rest of the world were taking those selfsame lessons on board—who dares call Western Samoa 'minnows' now?—Wales were locked in a time warp.

Instead of building up the pyramid from a solid base, the schoolboy level. Wales were building on shifting sands.

Yesterday, those sands became quicksands, sucking the image of the Welsh game down to an all-time low.

Work has belatedly begun on getting the structure right at schools, under 19, 20, and 21 levels.

But for the senior class of '91 it has been too little too late.

Now they find they are being out-muscled and out-thought by a nation not even considered good enough to be invited to World Cup 1 four years ago.

Even the innate Welsh way to counter the former—call it cunning—has been lost. And that is perhaps the saddest thing of all.

However, first and foremost, full credit to Peter Fatialofa's dynamic Samoans.

#### INROADS

As fully expected, they rocked Welsh ball-carriers with some tremendous tackling that first stopped them in their tracks and then put them in undignified retreat.

Fly half Stephen Bachop controlled and conducted things quite superbly while the big men—and that was most of the side—made huge inroads with their powerful running.

Be it the back row, all of whom were outstanding, or the midfield men like Frank Bunce, the result was much the same.

Wales flanker Emyr Lewis, forced to switch to No. 8 as the Welsh injury toll mounted to the three permissible replacements was immense.

But for many of the rest there were only moments when they had any significant impact—and that was never going to be enough.

After 'eye-balling' the Samoans as they conducted their pre-match Polynesian challenges, Wales found themselves viewing a scoreboard on which they were never in front.

Mathew Vaea and Mark Ring exchanged first half penalties, but the second half was merely seconds old when the Samoans took a lead they never surrendered.

Referee Patrick Robin ruled that centre To'o Vaega beat Robert Jones to the touch-down—though both first and second impressions proved otherwise.

But, as they say, that's history and the only thing that counts is the referee's decision.

Vaea converted and 10 minutes later there was no dispute when flanker Sila Vaifale crossed after some frantic and frenetic play.



Having already lost Phil May with a dislocated shoulder, Wales then lost Richie Collins (shoulder) and Tony Clement with a bruised hip.

That brought Martyn Morris, Garin Jenkins and Mike Rayer into the action, full back Rayer winning his first cap.

But the real disruption was up front. No. 8 Phil Davies switching to the second row and hooker Jenkins packing down at flanker.

Through all that, Wales finally came to life with a Lewis drive enabling Mike Haile to put Arthur Emyr over. Ring converted.

But a second Vaea penalty gave the Samoans a double-score cushion, and Wales skipper Ieuan Evans's late try was only an indication of what might have been.

The reality, however, is that Wales are left walking a World Cup tightrope.

Wales: A Clement (M Rayer, 46m); I Evans (capt), S Gibbs, M Hall, A Emyr; M Ring, R Jones; M Griffiths, K Waters, L Delaney, P May (M Morris, 29m), K Moseley, E Lewis, P Davies, R Collins (G Jenkins, 51m).

Scorers: Tries—Arthur Emyr. Ieuan Evans: pen con—Mark Ring.

Western Samoa: A Aiulupo; B Lima, T Vaea, F Bunce, T Tagaloa; S Bachop, M Vaea; P Fatialofa (capt), S Toomalatali, V Alalatoa, M Birtwhistle, M Keenan, S Vaifale, P Lam, A Perelini.

Scorers: Tries—To'o Vaea, Sila Vaifale: pens (2), con—Mathew Vaea.

Referee: Patrick Robin (France).

[From The Western Mail Sport, Oct. 7, 1991]

#### RUGBY FACES A CRISIS OF CONFIDENCE

(By Michael Boon)

This was the worst result for a British team on any sporting field since the USA beat England 1-0 at Belo Horizonte, Brazil, in soccer's 1950 World Cup.

The defeat of Wales was that sensational, that bad, that humiliating.

It took England another 16 years to come back and win the World Cup. You could be looking at a Welsh rugby revival taking just as long.

At national level, the game is where many of the players spent Sunday lunchtime . . . on the seat of their pants as they were knocked backwards time after time.

There is more and it is worse. After this result, rugby is no longer the national game of Wales—in terms of achievement, football is now the sport that speaks for Wales.

The next two weeks will show whether that is a passing aberration. If the rugby team now loses to Argentina and Australia, it will cease to be the game that starry-eyed youngsters want to play.

#### HORROR

And if Terry Yorath's football team again beat world champions Germany in Nuremberg on October 16, that is the sport that will fire the imagination of those tens of thousands of boys.

It is a crazy, incomprehensible turnaround that reflects how far rugby has dived since 1987 when Wales came home from the first World Cup in third place. The crisis is that savage.

The empty corridor outside the Welsh dressing room told the entire story. Where once there would have been hundreds of autograph hunters, there were six.

Scott Gibbs, one of the few players with real class, must have wondered about the Rugby League offer he rejected. He gave up financial stability for the rest of his days because he was intent on playing in the World Cup—and his was the most visible error of them all.

To his credit, he did not tiptoe around his moment of horror as he dropped the ball after Wales had put together the finest move of the match. "The gap was there, the ball was mine," he said flatly.

"It was a lapse of concentration because I thought the ball was going wide. No one needs to tell me how crucial a try would have been at that moment in the second half just as we were starting to put our game together."

The gesture that said it all came from Phil Davies. He sat on the Arms Park turf in total dejection in that sickening moment of defeat by the 100-1 outsiders, his head bowed as the Western Samoans celebrated all around him.

"We've got to come back and win the remaining two matches in our group. We can still do it!" he insisted later. Statistically, yes, but is the spirit there to pull the fat out of the fire?

"It is," he retorted. "It is not all gloom and doom. We made enough chances to win. We've worked too hard to see it all come apart now."

Brave words, Phil. At this appalling moment after the worst 80 minutes in the history of Wales rugby, the World Cup is further beyond the reach of Wales than it is of those impoverished islands in the southern oceans.

Whoever could have predicted that such a day would come to pass?

[From The Times, Oct. 7, 1991]

#### SAMOANS INFLICT CRUSHING BLOW ON WELSH PRIDE

(By Gerald Davis)

Wales ..... 13  
Western Samoa ..... 16

Western Samoa created a piece of rugby history at Cardiff Arms Park yesterday. In their first appearance on the World Cup stage, the small nation, with barely 2,000 players, succeeded brilliantly in inflicting a defeat on one of the traditional bastions of the game.

With an intense performance of powerful forward play, commitment to winning and keeping the available possession, the Samoans sent Wales, with their reputation grievously dented once more, reeling back to their camp to ponder what happens next. Indeed, this outstanding victory by a goal, a try and two penalties to a goal, a try and a penalty, raises the further question as to what other surprises are in store in the remaining matches in Pool 3.

On being asked back in the summer, on Manly Beach outside Sydney, to define the strengths of Western Samoa, their manager, Tate Simi, replied with a smile that none of the World Cup countries believed they had any. With an even broader smile, his team should have left no one in any doubt after yesterday's match what these strengths now are.

They have clearly absorbed the immense practicality and discipline of many of the All Black, virtues reinforced by the presence here of eight players from New Zealand's provincial unions, and married them to their own native enterprise and flair. Above all, their fierce and firm tackling, high but legitimate, left the Welsh players strewn on the ground and needing attention. May, Clement and Collins suffered the most and had to be replaced by Morris, Rayer and Jenkins. The rehabilitation centre in Brecon, rather than their Cardiff hotel, might well be a better place for further news about Wales this week.

In other ways, too Wales are sick with too many griefs. There is no respite to their de-

cline. This match, pronounced beforehand as the most significant in their 110-year history, was meant to signal a change of fortune. But it was not to be. They needed a victory upon which not only to build for the future but, more imminently, to carry them onwards to a quarterfinal place. If this, as the pessimists suggested, was a remote possibility to begin with, it is even more remote now, for Wales have to rely on the failures of others if they are to do so.

Those with their hearts firmly on their sleeves will rue the decision 35 seconds after the interval by the French referee, Patrick Robin, in allowing Western Samoa's first try, scored by Vaea. As the winger kicked ahead and chased with Robert Jones for the touchdown, the Welsh scrum-half got to the ball first. Robin was unsighted but awarded the score instead of what rightly should have been a Welsh drop-out on the 22-metre line.

After Vaea's first-half penalty had been cancelled by one from Ring, this try by Vaea, with the conversion, gave Western Samoa a 9-3 lead.

But, in truth, and wrong though the decision was, it was no more than Western Samoa deserved. Such was their command, even in the line-out, where they were expected to come off second best, they were making all the vital running. It was they who constantly held the reins. They made Wales look thoroughly uneasy and sometimes incompetent throughout.

To emphasise this, their second try, by Vaifale, came after a prolonged period of attack when any number of blue shirts were lining up for the score. Wales did threaten to come back after they had experienced their best period when Emyr scored a try which Ring converted to bring the score to 13-9, but Vaea's second penalty put paid to that. Evans scored a second try for Wales in injury time, but Wales could get no closer than 16-13. As Bryan Williams, the former All Black winger, now technical advisor to Western Samoa, said his team had found its place in the rugby sun.

Scorers: Wales: Tries: A Emyr, I Evans. Conversion: M Ring. Penalty: M Ring. Western Samoa: Tries: T Vaea, S Vaifale. Conversion: M Vaea. Penalties: M Vaea (2).

Wales: A Clement (rep M Rayer); I Evans (captain), S Gibbs, M Hall, A Emyr; M Ring, R Jones; M Griffiths, K Waters, L Delaney, R Collins (rep: G Jenkins), P May (rep: M Morris), K Moseley, E Lewis, P Davies.

Western Samoa: A Aiulupo; B Lima, T Vaea, F Bunce, T Tagaloa; S Bachop, M Vaea; P Fatialofa (captain), S Toomalatali, V Alalatoa, S Vaifale, M Birtwhistle, M Keenan, A Perelini, P Lam. Referee: P Robin (France).

#### Pool 3

	P	W	D	L	F	A	Pts
Australia .....	1	1	0	0	32	19	3
Western Samoa .....	1	1	0	0	16	13	3
Wales .....	1	0	0	1	13	16	1
Argentina .....	1	0	0	1	19	32	1

Results: Australia 32, Argentina 19; Wales 13, Western Samoa 16.

Fixtures: Oct. 9: Australia v Western Samoa (Pontypool, 1pm); Wales v Argentina (Cardiff, 8pm). Oct. 12: Wales v Australia (Cardiff, 3.15pm). Oct. 13: Argentina v Western Samoa (Pontypool, 1pm).

[From The Times, Oct. 7, 1991]

#### EVANS ACKNOWLEDGES ISLANDERS' STRENGTH

Wales were sent battered and bruised towards international rugby's second division in Cardiff yesterday, but their captain, Ieuan Evans, praised the Samoan performance, saying: "Their tackling was superb. We were being knocked back a couple of yards at a time.

"We must try to lift ourselves for the remaining matches in the group, and at least this was a greatly improved performance on the one in which we lost 63-6 to Australia in the summer."

About the Samoans' first try, Evans said: "I was only three yards away and Robert [Jones] clearly put his hands on the ball first. The referee was back on the 25 but we have to abide by his decision."

Alan Davies, the Wales coach, said: "Some of our players tried to take them on physically but were coming off second best. Only in the last 15 minutes, when we scored two tries, did we really get going."

"This team has only played together once before, against France last month, and were badly disrupted by Phil May's injury because we did not get enough set-piece possession on which our game-plan was based."

Bryan Williams, the Samoan coach and former All Black wing, said: "This is a great milestone for Western Samoa rugby and our greatest day." As a result, the odds on Wales winning the World Cup have gone from 66-1 to 250-1.

Wales will spend today at a rehabilitation centre in Brecon to nurse their wounds, both mental and physical, although May is almost certainly out of Wednesday's match against Argentina even though his dislocated shoulder has been put back.

Jonathan Davies, the former Welsh stand-off, was playing for Widnes against Castleford yesterday and put on the sort of display the Welsh are sadly missing. He scored a try, set up one for another former Welsh international, John Devereux, and kicked four goals.

Reacting to the match in Cardiff, Davies said: "I'm very sad and bitterly disappointed. Given the way things are, I prefer playing for Widnes rather than Wales. To improve, Wales have got to be much more aggressive, give out as much as they take, improve their tackling and the mobility of their forwards."

Although Wales came third in the 1987 World Cup, they lost to New Zealand in the semi-final 49-6 and the following year were beaten in New Zealand 52-3 and 54-9. On the recent tour to Australia, Wales were beaten 71-8 by New South Wales and 63-6 by Australia, their worst international result ever.

Before yesterday, though, their worst performances against emerging rugby nations were in 1983, when they lost on their first visit to Romania, and in 1988, when the Romanians won 15-9 in Cardiff.

#### SAMOANS MAKE A MARK

Western Samoa is a Polynesian nation based on two main islands, Savai'i and Upolu. The population of 250,000 is spread over 1,093 square miles in the south Pacific. A further 150,000 Samoans live overseas, most of them in New Zealand, 1,500 miles to the south.

The Samoan Islands were first visited by Europeans in the 1700s. Christian missionaries from London settled there in 1830.

The eastern islands (now called American Samoa) were ceded to the United States in 1904. Western Samoa, a former German colony, was administered by New Zealand from 1914 until independence in 1962.

Western Samoa can claim to produce, per capita, the most talented rugby players in the world. Michael Jones and Graeme Bachop, the All Blacks, are Samoans as is Willie Ofahegaue, of Australia.

[From the Western Mail, Oct. 7, 1991]  
WALES TOTTER ON BRINK OF FINAL SHAME  
(By John Kennedy)

Welsh rugby totters on the brink of the abyss of the final humiliation—having to qualify for the 1995 World Cup.

Black days in the national game are nothing new in recent troubled times.

But nothing can compare with the potential horrific consequences of yesterday's 16-13 defeat by Western Samoa at Cardiff Arms Park in a crucial Pool 3 lunchtime shoot-out.

Welsh hopes of being spared the ultimate indignity are now largely out of their own hands.

Of course, it is not the knock-out state yet, and Wales still have two Pool 3 matches to play, against Argentina and Australia.

But Ieuan Evans's shell-shocked team have to pick themselves up and beat the South Americans on Wednesday to keep even flickering hopes alive.

Even if they manage that, against a Pumas side who gave Australia a real battle, the Wallabies are still to come.

If Wales lose that one, then they have to bank on Argentina beating Western Samoa at Pontypridd next Sunday.

Because, assuming that cup favorites Australia keep a 100 per cent record, that would leave the other three on five points.

Then it would be a calculator job, probably finally coming down to a try-count.

Four years ago, that was just what happened when Argentina, Italy and Fiji completed their pool matches with one win each.

Fiji finally went through by virtue of just one try more than the Italians.

But if the Pumas beat Wales under the Arms Park floodlights on Wednesday, that will be curtains for Evans's team. Then it would be a winner-takes-all clash at Pontypridd with a quarter-final place at stake—with Wales nowhere.

At the most optimistic, however, the three-way tie is the sort of nail-biting scenario that is the price Welsh rugby has to pay after becoming the first IRB country to fall cup prey to one of the so-called lesser nations.

It stretched Wales's appalling Arms Park run to just two wins and a draw from their last 13 internationals in front of their own crowd.

This was the most sensational result of either this, or the inaugural, World Cup.

After the traumas of the summer tour Down Under, Wales always knew it was going to be a case of trying to scramble World Cup survival and making the quarter-finals.

Caretaker coach Alan Davies and manager Rob Norster knew that time was not on their side as they tried to repair damage going back years.

It all hinged on Wales beating Western Samoa and Argentina. But the South Sea Islanders deserved their day of supreme glory, out-muscling and out-thinking a Welsh team already on the rack before suffering three crucial injuries and the immense injustice of a decision by French referee Patrick Robin.

He was wrong to award a try to centre To'o Vaega when Robert Jones clearly got the first touch.

But referees are only human and Wales should have been good enough to cope with that.

They weren't. And now there is the appalling specter of this once great and proud rugby national having to compete with perhaps Holland, Spain, Romania and Italy merely for the chance to take part in four years' time.

After this, nothing can be taken for granted. That encapsulates just how fast and how far the once mighty have fallen.

[From the Western Mail, Oct. 7, 1991]  
REF'S TRYING DECISION

(By Graham Clutton and Michael Boon)

The try that destroyed Wales in the first minute of the second half—awarded to To'o Vaega and converted by Matthew Vaeu—was wrongly given by referee Patrick Robin.

Robert Jones confirmed what the television replays revealed. "I touched down first. It was close but my hand got there."

"Looking back, it is difficult to understand how the referee could form such an opinion from 20 years away. If he had spoken to his touch judges, he might well have given a different decision."

"It's the way it happens so often: when you are down, luck never seems to break your way."

His words were backed up by wing Arthur Emrys. "I was closest to Robert and there was not a shred of doubt in my mind that he won the race for the ball."

Jones added, "Now we've got to do it the hard way by beating Argentina and Australia."

"It was a bitterly disappointing day. We were well aware of their physical approach; we were equally aware of how much they have improved."

"But this misses the point. We went on the field to play our own game and failed to do so."

There was one shred of good news. The knee injury that Mark Ring sustained was not in the same area as his recent cartilage operation. "I'm confident that I'll be ready for Argentina on Wednesday," he said.

Gareth Edwards summed up the mood of the Arms Park by saying, "How can Wales lose at home to Western Samoa? Because we have fallen to that level!"

"Okay, so they scored a try which should not have been given . . . but if it had been disallowed and we had ended up by winning, the result would have wallpapered over the cracks."

J J Williams, another of the great names of the golden era, snapped, "It was a sham-ble. We were outclassed."

"Western Samoa had far more skill than us; every player showed far greater upper body strength."

"Tactically, too, we were naive. Our main idea was to kick the ball high into the air: when it failed, we had nothing else."

The most capped player of them all, JPR Williams, said, "In a word . . . embarrassing."

"They showed us how to tackle—I thought they were incredible in that department."

"What mystified me is why in the first half we had the ball so often at the back of the scrum. We simply do not have the pack to intimidate anyone."

"Our best plan was to get the ball out and move it. When we did that in the second half as we started to play from 3-13 down, both our wings scored tries. The answer was right there and we didn't see it until too late."

Wales will "take a close look at themselves" over the next 48 hours and put right the problems that have made their chances of qualifying for the World Cup quarter-finals almost impossible.

Team manager Robert Norster said, "It was always a tough group to be in, but having lost against Western Samoa makes ours an uphill task."

"One of our goals was to win this first game, but we have failed to do it. We must now go back to playing our game plan which we didn't manage today."



And coach Alan Davies was quick to defend his side by saying, "I don't think we should take anything away from Western Samoa. They are a good side."

Skipper Ieuan Evans said, "They are a good outfit. They tackled very hard and were always involved in the game."

Skipper Peter Fatialofa said it was the greatest day in Western Samoan rugby history.

Fatialofa, who played a massive part in helping guide his side to the famous Arms Park victory said, "Had we lost it would have put Samoan rugby back 20 years. I am over the moon. It is the greatest day in my life and the greatest day for Western Samoan rugby."

#### GEORGE LEWIS RUSSELL, SR.

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

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues today in expressing my sadness over the passing of our friend George Russell. George was a man who embodied the finest qualities of a civil servant. He served for many years with the Government Printing Office before coming to Congress in 1973. While appointed to his position by the majority party, he unflinchingly served all the Members in an impartial manner and I considered him a close friend.

I looked forward to our almost daily conversations in which George would share his wonderful sense of humor and outlook on life. And since George was so adept at taking care of business, our conversations could quickly turn to other matters, such as family. George always lit up as he talked about his family—his wife, Helen, son, George, Jr., and daughter, Diane were a source of great pride and joy to him. In fact, his daughter Diane is continuing in the family tradition as a congressional aide for our colleague TIM VALENTINE. And of course what grandfather could resist bragging about his grandchildren—Shantee, Brian and Brenden.

There are certain individuals that always make your day—George was one of those people. Finally, I would be remiss if I did not also share the grief of our mutual friend, former Congressman Gene Taylor. I know Gene valued George's friendship and wise counsel in the ways of the House. We will both miss him very much.

#### A REPORT ON DESERT SHIELD/STORM

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, there has been a lot of press concerning the Army decision not to use National Guard combat units during Desert Shield/Storm. Some of these reports conclude that the Guard units were not ready. I want to share with you the

introduction and the summary of a report by our colleague, JOHN SPRATT, from South Carolina which comes to a different conclusion.

Along these lines, I have asked the GAO to provide a report on the three active brigades as compared to the Guard roundout brigades they replaced. The Congress needs to know if the resources and reliance on our Guard and Reserve has been well placed or wasted. I believe the answer is it brought us more military capability for our money. It seems clear from JOHN SPRATT's report that all sides of the story are not being told. I urge my colleagues to read the entire report to see a different side.

#### THE CALL-UP OF NATIONAL GUARD COMBAT UNITS DURING OPERATIONS DESERT SHIELD/STORM

(A report on the South Carolina Army National Guard To Hon. Les Aspin, chairman, House Armed Services Committee by Representative John M. Spratt, Jr.)

##### INTRODUCTION

When President Bush authorized the mobilization of 200,000 troops to the Persian Gulf, he triggered the first true test of the Total Force Concept. But in its first test, a significant element of the Total Force was left out: combat units from the National Guard. How and why this happened—and the implications—are the focus of this report.

On August 24th, 1990, when Secretary of Defense Dick Cheney published his implementing instructions for the President's call-up two days earlier, he made clear that the Army was limited to 25,000 reserve component combat support and combat service support personnel—personnel specialties which reside for the most part in the reserve components. His decision deliberately excluded all Army National Guard and Reserve combat units.

At this point, the strategy in Saudi Arabia was defensive. The Pentagon was planning only a six-month tour of duty for all troops deployed there. DoD defended its decision by explaining that the call-up's 180-day limit would leave little time for Army Guard and Reserve combat units to muster personnel and equipment, complete training, deploy overseas, and still make a meaningful contribution in the theater.

Seemingly in opposition to the spirit, if not the letter, of the Total Force Concept, the decision to exclude these Army combat units did not sit well with Army Guard and Reservists, especially with those in the so-called "roundout" brigades and battalions. These units train and equip with the active Army, and had been led to expect that when their parent active unit deployed, they would deploy with them. The decision also did not meet the expectations of Congress. In order for reserve component combat units, including roundout units, to be deployed, Congress used the FY 1991 Defense Appropriations Act to add 180 days to the existing 180 day call-up authority.

In early November, three days after the appropriations bill passed, Secretary Cheney announced the call-up of the Army Guard roundout brigades—the 48th, the 155th, and the 256th. At the same press conference, General Colin Powell stated that these brigades would need "work-up" training, which would include a rotation through the National Training Center (NTC).

Despite the fact that elements of the 48th Infantry Brigade (Mech) had rotated through the NTC the previous summer and were certified combat-ready, the entire brigade was required to rotate through again. By the time the brigade completed this training and

was certified combat-ready on February 28th, President Bush had proclaimed a ceasefire in the Persian Gulf. Members of the National Guard who were temporarily aligned with the 48th, some of whom are in my district, believe they would have deployed if the war had not ended so quickly. But the fact that they were delayed so long and not deployed continues to rankle.

Since the roundout concept was first formulated, Congress has legitimized it by funding the roundout units with the same equipment and training priority as their parent active component units. Other reserve combat units, which are not roundout units but are "CAPSTONE" aligned to active Army organizations in time of war, are similarly equipped. One roundout unit in the South Carolina Army National Guard, for example, is equipped with M-1 tanks and Bradley Fighting Vehicles. Another unit, CAPSTONE-aligned with the XVIII Airborne Corps, is equipped with Apache helicopters. For these units, a quid pro quo has always been clear: if equipped and trained like active combat units, they would be sent to war like the active combat units.

When the Gulf War came, the reserve units upheld their part of the bargain. They were eager to go, and the fact that they weren't sent with their parent active units has left a rift between the Army's active and reserve component forces. As Maj. Gen. Robert F. Ensslin, Jr., President of the National Guard Association wrote in *National Guard* magazine, "Many of us in the Guard have gained the perception that our combat arms units were put in a position where it was almost impossible to succeed. Because the Army did not need them in Saudi Arabia and because many active Army officers instinctively disbelieve that a Guard maneuver unit (infantry and armor) can be combat ready, they set up a self-fulfilling prophecy."

General Eston Marchant, the Adjutant General of the South Carolina National Guard, puts it even more bluntly: "It adds up to us the way 2 + 2 add up: If the Guard was mobilized, and did well in the theater, the Army would be in worse shape in sustaining the force structure of the active components."

According to Marchant, the question of why the Guard combat units were not sent has been a "source of great agonizing" for National Guard men and women in South Carolina. "It was a matter of pride to start with," said Marchant, "but as the Pentagon drumbeat about readiness stepped up, it became a matter of credibility." The readiness issue is a sore point. "I highly resent the remarks [by Secretary Cheney] that 'the war proved that the Guard was not ready,'" said Marchant.

After hearing similar complaints from National Guard members all over my state, I thought the subject should be investigated. On July 12th, several members of the Committee Staff and I met with members of South Carolina National Guard combat units that did not deploy to the Gulf. The following case studies highlight some of the information we gathered during those discussions.

The decision not to deploy reserve component combat units with their parent units in the active Army has opened a breach between the reserve components and the active Army.

That said, I am not ready to conclude that there was a conspiracy on the part of the active Army, or to believe that the Army sought to discredit its reserve combat components. There were operational consider-

ations driving the type of units needed in the early stages of the conflict. If there were also political considerations, the Secretary of Defense may have felt that the forces deployed could face a long stalemate in the desert, and the reserves would be the first to lose patience. Or he may have foreseen bloody battles on the ground and felt that heavy casualties in the Guard and Reserve would provoke opposition to the war.

These considerations are reasonable, except for one fact: they contradict the concept of the Total Force. The other services were not guided by them. They deployed their Reserve and Guard combat units without the 60-90 days of additional training required of Army reserve components, and their decision was vindicated. Air Force reserve component combat units, such as the 169th Tactical Fighter Group of the South Carolina Air National Guard, acquitted themselves particularly well in the Gulf without the extra training.

Army combat reserve component units had to be "put through their paces," in the words of Secretary Cheney. The Army had long had a system for rating combat readiness, but Army reserve components were made to undergo a formal validation process, in which many felt "the rules were changed." This left an overall impression that Army Guard and Reserve combat components were either not ready or not capable.

My report focuses on just three of the Guard units that could have been deployed during the Gulf conflict. Obviously, I can't claim that these units represent all combat units in the Army Guard and Reserve, but I think I can fairly say that if these units had been deployed with their parent active units, they would have been ready. And if the Army had sought in earnest to test the Total Force, units like these could have been selected and deployed with their parent units in the active Army. Had such units been deployed, they could have trained as roundout units with their parent units in the theater. Instead, they were forced to train with units with which they were not familiar; and they lacked priority when it came to getting spare parts or filling personnel shortages—the shortage of tank mechanics and service support people for the 148th Infantry is a case in point.

The decision not to deploy these units has hurt morale and training. It has also hurt the working relationship between Army active and reserve components. And it has left an important piece missing in the first full test of the Total Force.

Nonetheless, this much at least was learned about the Army's combat reserve components:

First, the combat units in line to be activated sought to be activated—they did not try to avoid service;

Second, Congress did not stand in the way but instead supported the call-up of the reserves; and

Third, units like the 1/263 AR, the 1/151 AV, and the 4/178 FA were ready and capable, and could have been deployed with their parent active units.

All of the above is positive. But since the country is spending large sums on the reserves components and will rely on reserve forces even more in the future, answers are needed about the Army's reserve combat components that Desert Storm didn't provide.

Some of those answers may lie in units like the 1/263 AR, 1/151 AV, and the 4/178 FA. If in fact these units were ready and capable of being deployed, then the shortcomings

that rendered other units un-ready may not be inherent in the Guard, as some in the active Army seem to think. Surely it is worth the Army's asking how these units differed from others in officer and NCO cadres, and in training, experience, and equipment.

It also seems worth the Army's effort to ask why its system for combat readiness rating was not ready itself for real conflict, at least with regard to the reserve components. Any system of readiness rating worthy of the name ought to indicate which forces are deployable in combat and which are not; and it ought to tell reserve unit commanders candidly whether their units measure up, and if not, where correction is needed. Further, the Army should establish once and for all at which unit level readiness for combat will be decided. If it determines that readiness needs to be measured at the task force or brigade combat team level, National Guard units should be required to periodically train at those levels.

Much of the confusion concerning mobilization at the National Guard combat unit level probably stemmed from the murky alignment system in place for short-notice contingencies. Insofar as possible, the Army should make clear the alignments it has planned for different contingencies. These plans need to be communicated clearly to both active and reserve components in advance of any conflict.

Congress also needs to be told candidly whether the Total Force is rhetoric or reality when it comes to Army Guard and Reserve combat units. We have bought into the concept of the Total Force with more ardor than DoD itself. Convinced that we are getting skill and experience at lower cost, Congress has been equipping Army reserve component combat units with state-of-the-art equipment, such as M-1 tanks and Apache helicopters. We need to know if our confidence is misplaced, or if the Total Force works for the Army as well as it works for all the services. The three units studied here are only part of the answer; but their case histories indicate that the Total Force should include combat units in the Army reserve and that these units can and should deploy when a crisis occurs.

#### H.R. 3533—FOREIGN INVESTMENT SAFEGUARDS

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to establish several safeguards against an ominous trend in foreign investment in the United States. We all know that the Congress has acted judiciously in the last 20 years to prevent direct foreign investment in certain firms, industries, and sectors of the United States we deem vital to our national security. We have also taken care to require that the administration monitor and verify the rate and type of foreign investment carefully.

The American people and the Congress also recognize that a certain amount of foreign investment is necessary in our system. A fundamental requirement of our economic system is the constant replenishing of capital, of investment, in stagnant industries and new ventures. New investment, whether by Americans or non-Americans, is essential to the engines of growth powering our economy. Without it,

our system would collapse. With it, American industries have proven able to continue to grow at the leading edge of technology and services.

Foreign investment is also the unfortunate byproduct of our Federal budget deficit and our trade deficit. Indeed, investment from abroad rushes in to replace the fall in American investment. If foreign interests did not invest in some American assets, growth in those areas would often be stymied, as no American interest would be able to meet the price. These are the facts of our economic state today.

The people of the central coast of California and my colleagues here in the Congress know of my own efforts as chairman of the House Budget Committee to bring down the Federal budget deficit and thereby contribute to the easing of our trade deficit, the boosting of our economy, and the lowering of foreign investment in the United States, and I will continue to persevere in this regard. The significant reduction of the Federal budget deficit remains my top legislative priority. From that accomplishment will flow many, many economic dividends to the American people.

Until that day, however, I believe that my colleagues will recognize that we must continue to safeguard against several real and destabilizing possibilities. It is increasingly apparent that our cultural industries, particularly the entertainment and motion picture industries, are in danger of being dominated by foreign owners. It seems to me that this phenomenon is not healthy for America, nor would it be accepted by any other nation.

In Germany, foreign interests are banned from investing in broadcasting networks and stations. France prevents foreigners from purchasing a majority stake in television firms. In Australia, the print media are protected from foreign ownership altogether, and no more than 15 percent of Australian radio outlets may be foreign-owned. Japan, which does not ban foreign investment in these sectors outright, nevertheless possesses nearly insurmountable cultural and political barriers to foreign investment in such firms.

In a related sector, our film industry is quickly being bought up by foreign investors. Here, again, we ought not to allow our motion picture industry and related firms to be run from abroad. The United States, the center of the film industry, stands to lose both its artistic license and its integrity as a truly American institution through the intangible but sure process of foreign owners' discreet direction, implicit censorship, or pervasive corporate philosophy. I do not doubt that most foreign owners of the entertainment industry are responsible global citizens. But I would like to leave in place a suitable fail-safe mechanism to ensure that America continues to receive the full range of independent artistic expression on a mass scale.

My third concern is foreign investment in our public and privately held public places and services. In my view, we have a right to expect that places of interest and pride will remain the property of Americans subject to American law. Regrettably, our cities, States, and the Federal Government are in poor economic conditions. Given their inclination to look to every resource for revenues, it be-



hooves us to protect cities, States, and the Federal Government from selling off public, State, and national parks. While the prospect of such a sale to foreign investors is not likely, it is perhaps a necessary precaution.

American ownership of historically significant properties is equally important, in my view, and my legislation would prevent foreign interests from controlling places designated by State and national historic registers. Likewise, private areas, such as Cypress Point, with its famous cypress tree, and Rockefeller Center's public park are national public fixtures. The concessions and services at our national parks are fundamentally American in service and style and should remain so. We should preserve these landmarks as American holdings owned and run by Americans.

My legislation does not prohibit foreign ownership of our cultural industries. Rather, it sets a ceiling industry-wide with the hope and expectation that foreign investment will never rise to that level. The bill would prohibit foreign ownership of more than 50 percent of American cultural industries. It seems prudent and reasonable to me to establish a level of foreign investment in this sector above which foreign investment would not be permissible. Given the current pace of investment, it is also urgent. Foreign ownership of an entire firm would remain legal, but the legislation would ensure that a full majority of our cultural industries remain controlled by Americans.

With respect to national parks and landmarks, however, I see no reason to allow the Federal Government to sell off national lands. My legislation prohibits majority foreign control of landmarks now privately held as well as service firms at such landmarks and parks.

Mr. Speaker, these safeguards are urgent. I invite my colleagues' review and cosponsorship of this important legislation and urge its timely adoption by the full House.

H.R. 3533

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

#### SECTION. 1. PROHIBITION OF OWNERSHIP OF NATIONAL LANDMARKS BY FOREIGN PERSONS

(a) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a national landmark shall not be acquired directly by 1 or more foreign persons.

(b) OWNERSHIP THROUGH CORPORATIONS PROHIBITED.—No corporation may hold a national landmark if 1 or more foreign persons own directly or indirectly more than 50 percent of the total number of shares of stock of such corporation.

#### SEC. 2. PROHIBITION OF TRANSFER OF AREAS INCLUDED IN THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM TO FOREIGN PERSONS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may not transfer any right, title, or interest of the United States in or to any area of land or water administered by the Secretary through the National Park Service, if, as a result of such transfer, such right, title, or interest would be held directly or indirectly by any foreign person.

#### SEC. 3. PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN INVESTMENTS IN UNITED STATES CULTURAL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES BY FOREIGN PERSONS.

The Chairman shall prohibit any investment in a corporation by a foreign person if such investment would result in direct or in-

direct ownership by 1 or more foreign persons of more than 50 percent of the total number of shares of stock in United States cultural business enterprises.

#### SEC. 4. REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If any investment by a foreign person would result in such foreign person becoming a 5-percent shareholder in—

(1) a United States cultural business enterprise, or

(2) a corporation which directly or indirectly holds a national landmark, such foreign person shall register such investment with the Chairman.

(b) CONTENTS OF REGISTRATION.—Each registration required under subsection (a) shall be filed at such time, and in such form and manner, as the Chairman may require by regulations.

#### SEC. 5. APPLICATION OF ACT TO OWNERSHIP THROUGH NON-CORPORATE ENTITIES.

In the case of an entity that is not a corporation, the Chairman shall apply rules similar to the rules provided in this Act.

#### SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION.

The Chairman may undertake such actions as the Chairman considers necessary or appropriate to assure compliance with the provisions of this Act.

#### SEC. 7. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) The term "Chairman" means the Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

(2) The term "5-percent shareholder" means a person who holds directly or indirectly 5-percent or more of the total number of shares of stock in a corporation.

(3) The term "foreign person" means—

(A) any individual who is not a citizen of the United States; and

(B) any person controlled directly or indirectly by 1 or more individuals described in subparagraph (A).

(4) The term "national landmark" means—  
(A) a nationally-known private urban square, a private park, and any other private open space used by the public within the United States;

(B) any property within the United States designated as a National Historic Landmark or included on the National Register of Historic Places in accordance with the provisions of section 101 of the National Historic Preservation Act; and

(C) the right or license to provide services within an area of the National Park System.

(5) The term "United States cultural business enterprise" means any enterprise organized under the laws of the United States, any State, or the District of Columbia, that is engaged in the cultural or entertainment industry of the United States.

#### SEC. 8. REGULATIONS.

The Chairman shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this Act.

#### SEC. 9. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall apply to investments acquired after the date of the enactment of this Act.

□ 1740

#### TIMBER PRODUCTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. CHANDLER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in this Sunday's Seattle Times. The article is written by Richard Larsen, a highly professional and respected journalist in our city.

I might add that he is a former staff member of the U.S. House of Representatives. He was in the office of our Speaker, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. FOLEY] before he was Speaker.

The article is entitled "From Timber Towns, a Cry for Compassion."

Mr. Speaker, the article simply points out the total acreage of forest land that has been withdrawn from timber production in our State of Washington. When we consider the wilderness, the parks, other set-asides and now regulations to protect the spotted owl, the total number of acres comes to 9.3 million. Nine million three hundred thousand acres has been taken out of timber production.

The result has been catastrophic.

Mills have had to close. Men and women have lost their jobs by the thousands and more job losses are threatened. The result has been something that the article points out, and that I would like to suggest to my colleagues has been overlooked, the impact on people.

Families are now experiencing as they never have before violence, divorce, drug and alcohol problems, children having problems in school. These greater social costs occur at the same time communities lose tax revenue. Small, rural towns lose the means to deal with these problems.

Entire communities are literally threatened with devastation. People are hurting, Mr. Speaker, and they are pleading for our help. We need legislation this year to address the problem of the spotted owl and timber set-asides. But we also must consider the plight of people who depend on those public forests.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me. This is an issue which touches a lot of people in rural areas and that we need to bring to the attention of our colleagues.

I include for the RECORD a copy of the article to which I referred.

[From the Seattle Times, Oct. 6, 1991]

FROM TIMBER TOWNS, A CRY FOR COMPASSION

(By Richard W. Larsen)

It was a loud cry of human pain, but you probably didn't hear it or pay much attention to it.

Carol Owens explained how the anguish of prolonged unemployment and uncertainty about the future can damage even the most resilient psyche in people of all ages—especially the children.

"Children are the barometers of the problem," explained Owens, director of human services for Clallam County. She told of behavioral changes, dropoffs in schoolwork, and other symptoms.

In families that may once have had only minor problems, "there's more violence, more substance abuse . . ." Owens added.

When the fathers are thrown out of work, there's not only loss of the paycheck, but Mom, Dad and kids usually are stripped of medical insurance. Other speakers described other pain, especially the plunge of local economies and the financial crises hitting schools and county government.

If that epidemic of distress were hitting thousands of men, women and children and the major businesses in one of our metropolitan areas, it would be the heart-tugging top story on television and in the rest of the news media.

But all this went without much news play: It was just another description of what's happening to people living away from the media centers—in small towns such as Forks, Raymond, Darrington, Hoquiam.

It all came in testimony during a recent hearing in Olympia conducted by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Topic: Effects of reducing timber harvests to meet the habitat needs of the spotted owl.

For all kinds of social/psychological reasons, the cries from people in Washington's timber communities haven't caught the attention of many people in urban areas. (On the day of that testimony in Olympia, the top story in Seattle and Tacoma was the financial trouble of Frederick & Nelson.)

In part, it's a symptom of the political and social segregation that has developed between rural and urban Washington. And, because it's complicated and seems to drone on and on, the issue of the spotted owl and timber becomes only a monotonous, background hum in the daily life of most of the state.

The spotted owl rides high on a wide tide of environmental concerns. As one of the witnesses told the federal panel at Olympia, there's a bias among those who, without facts, assume that thousands of acres of Washington forestlands—especially federal forests—are being laid waste by mindless, excessive tree cutting.

During the past century, in fact, the bulk of all federal landholdings across the state have been withdrawn from timber harvest. Data collected by the Northwest Forestry Association portray the chronology of forest preservation in the state (note graph):

During the 1930s Congress created the national parks—Mount Rainier and Olympic—and national recreation areas such as the North Cascades. In all, nearly 3 million Washington acres went into preservation status, including much of the state's commercial-forest base.

During and after the 1970s came the wilderness-area set-asides on other federal lands—the scenic Alpine Lakes, Glacier Peak, Mount Baker, the vast Pasayten, and many others. Another 1-million-plus acres.

New planning that came out of the National Forest Management Act of 1976 produced the biggest-ever removal of federal forestlands from traditional multiple use that included timber harvest—about 3.1 million acres.

As part of that new planning, another 967,000 acres was to be managed for primary uses other than timber production. (The subtotal so far is 78 percent of the original federal forestland in the state.)

The Northern Spotted Owl conservation areas recommended by the Interagency Scientific Committee (ISC) increased the set-asides by 997,000 acres.

And the newest critical-habitat designation for the spotted owl would withdraw an additional 164,000 acres.

That adds up to 9.3 million acres withdrawn from the original 10.3-million-acre federal forestland base. So, noted one

woman, timber-dependent communities find themselves struggling to exist on a residual fraction of the total federal forestland . . . and are told they must give up more.

A logger's wife drilled this Seattle writer with a question: "Why is there no compassion for us?" She protested the media's villainization of the timber worker: "We're people who care about the environment. We live here."

At the very least, she lectured me, someone should write it into the record that millions of acres of Washington forests and mountains stand preserved—a vast, rich habitat for hundreds of species of wild animals and birds, offering recreation and scenic opportunity for everyone in the state . . . forever.

OK. There it is.

#### A CONGRESS TO BE PROUD OF

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

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I will not take the full 60 minutes, I do not think, but I do want to speak about the concept of a Congress that we can be proud of.

It may seem quixotic to come down here in the midst of all the recent mess and outrage, and I understand there will be a poll in the New York Times tomorrow talking about how people feel about the Congress. I want to reverse the way we normally talk about this institution. I want to suggest that the standard we should be working on is the concept of a Congress that we can be proud of, that Capitol Hill, which is the most famous single site in the United States, should in fact be a hill that people look at, that it should in a sense be part of that shining city on a hill that all of us should aspire to.

We have seen wonderful moments of freedom across the planet. We are seeing exciting moments of people getting new-found rights and new-found opportunities to participate. Yet in the end, that freedom comes down to voting, to electing representatives, to having something like the Congress, whether it is in Russia or Poland or Latvia or Lithuania or Estonia or in Cuba, where we hope soon that there will be democracy and we want to be the kind of Congress that we can say with pride, people in Cuba could then look to.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Florida, a good friend who is such an able Representative.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I want to say that coincidentally enough, tomorrow begins a very important event in Cuba, which is another Congress of the Communist Party.

Of course, we know what is going to come out of that congress, the same old tired ideas, the same old stale notions about what does not work. We know what does work, and that has

been the democratic reforms that have swept over the entire world, not only in Nicaragua and Panama, that tore down the Berlin Wall, and the democratic reforms that are taking place right now in the Soviet Union.

I have no doubt that soon those democratic reforms will take place in my native homeland of Cuba, and I know that the new Americans that are coming up and taking lots of important positions in south Florida, especially the Haitian population, the Cuban-Americans, the Nicaraguans, they all come to the United States because it truly is still the land of opportunity, the land of democracy and the land for everyone to get their fair day in whatever dream they want to make a reality.

I do believe that we have a lot to thank for the Bush administration and the Reagan revolution to help us get to the position where we are now.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida for her contribution. She always represents ably the interests and the cause of freedom and self-government.

What I want to say in the next few minutes is going to sound very naive and very optimistic, and people are going to say, how can a Member of the House who has been here for a while and who serves in the leadership, how can he say these naive optimistic things?

One of the most important moments in my life was sitting on the Capitol steps during President Ronald Reagan's first inauguration in 1981, in January. He was being sworn in. We were in the middle of a malaise. We had 13-percent inflation, 22-percent interest rates. The economy was decaying. The Russians were invading Afghanistan. People felt terrible about things.

We had almost lost our way as a country.

President Reagan stood there and as part of his first inaugural address he said, we have every right to dream heroic dreams. After all, we are Americans.

I want to talk about a heroic dream, a dream that was held by Washington and Madison, by Jefferson and Monroe, by Benjamin Franklin and by Adams, a dream that extended across the planet, a dream that we have heard in the last few years from this particular place, from Lech Walesa, when he was the head of Solidarity, from Vaclav Havel, the President of Czechoslovakia, from Violeta Chamorro, the new President of Nicaragua, from Salinas, the President of Mexico, and in luncheons around this Capitol, from Boris Yeltsin, the first freely elected President of Russia, what each of them has said.

It really affected me because I was there personally. I was able to witness it. I know what happened.

What each of them said was that the American dream, the American belief,



the American commitment to freedom had changed their country; that they, whether they were Mexican or Nicaraguan or Polish or Hungarian or Russian, they owed America, because the American solution was sweeping the world and because our concept of human rights, of being endowed by our Creator with certain inalienable rights, of being allowed to pursue happiness, that these basic conditions of a free press, free property, trial by jury, the concept of the law, free elections with a secret ballot, all of these things had come together and that the American solution adapted in slightly different ways in each country was in fact opening up for human beings whether they are Lithuanian or Latvian or Estonian or Russian or Polish or Hungarian or Mexican or Nicaraguan, was opening up for human beings the possibility of greater happiness, greater prosperity, a better future, more safety.

Then we come to our own institution. I want to say that there can be nothing to make one prouder, except getting married and having children, than to be allowed to serve in the Congress, to swear to uphold the Constitution, to know that your fellow citizens freely elected you to the greatest deliberative bodies in the world, to be here in the people's House, to know that one stands on 200 years of tradition of people being elected, coming from all over a great Nation, meeting, arguing, talking, debating, voting, and yet that process goes back more than 200 years all the way back to the Founding Fathers, to the provincial assemblies of Virginia and Georgia, and across the 13 Colonies, and back beyond them to the House of Commons in England and finally to the Magna Carta from 1215, a copy of which is on display here in the Capitol to remind us that we represent now almost 800 years of people trying to find a way to organize and protect and safeguard freedom and to give human beings opportunity.

In that sense, I want to argue that there is a simple basic standard that we have to move toward. First that we have to be committed to honest self-government, that we are here as servants of the people, that we are stewards of our heritage, that we have an obligation to shepherd our Nation into a better future and that as servants and stewards and shepherds, we have to uphold a standard worthy of freedom and worthy of a free people.

So honest self-government should be our battle cry. It should be our commitment as Members of the Congress.

Second, we have to be committed to the concept of a Congress one can be proud of. We have to have that feeling that no matter what that day's news story is, no matter what that evening's television story is, no matter what the comedian's latest joke is, we can stand at the bottom of that Hill and we can tell schoolchildren that this is the Cap-

itol of the United States, this is the Congress and that on this Hill men and women gather freely to represent free people who honorably debate, who honorably argue and who engage in a process of legislation as the result of which 260 million people scattered across a great continent are able to lead a future peacefully together.

This concept of a Congress one can be proud of is pretty simple. It is a concept that frankly all of us fall short of. It is a concept that I have to confess on occasion I have fallen short of, but it is the right standard. It is the right principle.

Does it make one proud to serve in the Congress? Does it make one proud to recruit people to run? Whatever party one belongs to, instead of saying I do not want to go there, I do not want to be part of them, do not want to get involved in that, we ought to have a standard that is high enough and tough enough and real enough and firm enough that people can say with pride, "Yes, it would be a great honor. I wish I could join. I would be proud to someday be in that body legislating and serving the Nation."

Let me draw a distinction. We have always had jokes. It has always been something to laugh about because I think part of the way a free people deals with power is to laugh about the people who have the power.

It is true that Will Rogers is right out there in the hallway, his statue facing the House door, because he said he wanted to keep his eye on the boys. It is true that in the 1880's Mark Twain said the only common criminal class in America is the Congress. It is true that over the years humorists have made jokes, but there is a difference between jokes being made about you and becoming a joke.

We cannot tolerate a level of cynicism, a level of despair, a level of almost neolithic self-destruction in which we allow the institution to decay so that the institution ceases to have self-respect. Because in a free society, one cannot govern with raw power. One is not going to have a secret police. One is not going to be able to enforce one's will at a sword point and bear that point.

One is not going to be able to shoot people. One can only, in a free society, enforce power by authority because people believe in you, because in the end, they are willing to do what collectively you have concluded.

□ 1750

Now I must say that in the process of honest self-government it is not always easy, it is not always possible to reach out and know exactly what you are doing, and know for sure it is going to be the right thing. And when you get 435 Members here, and you have 100 Members in the Senate, clearly sometimes there will be human weakness,

sometimes there will be errors, sometimes there will be mistakes, and that is just the history of bringing together 535 human beings.

But there is a difference between the standard for the institution and the occasional failure of the individuals, and we cannot allow the institution to decay until it comes to reflect the most mediocre or the lowest standard individuals can attain. So we face I think an institutional crisis, a crisis not just illustrated by the Sergeant at Arms account, or illustrated by various reports on other kinds of things, but a core crisis of how people see this building, because there is something very, very almost sacred here. There is the repository of the dream and the hopes and the fears of the people of the United States. This is the room in which people come to argue, and if the system is working right, people should go and file for office because they truly want to represent and speak for and argue for the hopes and dreams of folks back home. And then everybody in the neighborhood should vote and pick somebody they want to represent them, to speak for them, to serve them.

Then, when that person arrives here, they should bring the messages from back home: Here is what the reality is like, here is how the economy feels, here is how the people feel about crime, here are their concerns about health and education, and then honorable men and women, operating in an honorable process, should work in an orderly way to have legislation occur in such a manner that everybody is able to have their rights protected, that everybody is able to have their chance to speak, that everybody is able to bring witnesses, that the schedule allows everyone to be represented so that in the process of the 2 years of a particular Congress the country can say that those folks up on that Hill in Washington are doing their job. They are doing the right thing. They are doing it honorably. So even when people disagree, they can support and improve the process, because very often in life everyone who is an adult knows we do not always get our way. But if we have a fair chance to make the argument, then we can abide by the group decision.

What gradually kills a system of freedom is when we gradually become corrupted by power, we become corrupted by institutional protections. We get to a point where we no longer have to be fair to the American people. We no longer have to be open with the American people. We no longer have to give the American people a real chance, a real chance to elect people with fair elections in which challengers have a reasonable chance of winning, a real chance to have their voice heard by scheduling key issues to come to the floor and be voted on, a fair chance to amend and to vote on things, and a

fair recorded vote so that the people back home can see and they can measure whether or not their representative in fact represents them anymore.

The reason I think we have a growing alienation and a growing sense that the Congress is no longer representative, and the House is not really the House of Representatives, it is now the house of aristocracy, is because people feel they cannot reach their Member, that they cannot have themselves spoken for, that they do not get a fair chance, that somehow the system is designed so that they never win, they never get a vote, they never get their bill heard, they never have their voice heard, and the membership is gradually like an aristocracy, growing further away, and protecting itself in ways that people cannot get to.

We can spend a lot of time, those of us who love this institution, who believe in freedom, those of us who believe in the legislative process, we can spend a lot of time running around and chasing after each scandal. We can wait for the next headline to blow up. We can run out and say let us go solve that one, or let us pretend it did not exist, or figure out a good, plausible explanation, or say gee, at least I am not involved. I do not think that is good enough. I think if there is truly love for freedom, and there is truly care about the process by which human beings govern themselves, and about honest self-government, if we truly care for America's future, really want the Congress to be one we can be proud of, then I believe we have an obligation to design a standard that we are prepared to defend in public, to have an open, accountable institution that has standard we can agree on, that is willing to face the public and say yes, we do these things because they are necessary to function as the legislative body. We do these things because it is necessary to represent 260 million people, and we are prepared to educate any of you and open up and show you how we operate so that you can see that you are in fact truly being represented in Washington, DC.

I just want to say to my colleagues we are playing a very dangerous game when we run away from the alienation and the antagonism and the hostility we face today. We should instead be listening to the American people. We should be trying to understand what they really want, because collectively the American people are amazingly smart. They do not want a dictatorship. They do not want some silly childish system where they get their way every morning and no information matters. What they do want is a sense of being heard, a sense of fairness and a sense of fair play. They want a sense of honor and dignity and reasonableness, and they want to know that we are setting up a system that operates not primarily for the benefit of a polit-

ical aristocracy, but instead for the benefit of the American people. And they recognize that we have to have a Republican representative form of government in which we select somebody and send them here, and they recognize that in a healthy system the folks who come here are going to know more than the folks who stay back home. But they want us to be connected enough, and they want us to be open enough, they want us to be back home enough and available enough that we can experience what they experience and that we truly represent them. That is why it is called the House of Representatives.

I want to suggest to my colleagues that the term limitation movement is a pretty good indication of the level of alienation. If Members look around they see a steadily growing pattern across the country of support for term limitation. They see more and more people giving up on the old system, giving up on the process of being able to elect people as long as they want to. The reason I think is quite simple. People are coming to the conclusion that as bad as term limitation is, and let me say that while I am a supporter of the constitutional amendment I think it is the second worst choice we have, the worst one being the current system. I think there are many better things we could do than term limitation, but I do not see any evidence that the Congress will do them. I see term limitation as a last resort, not a first resort. But I see it as a vital resort, because I think it is necessary as a club and as a warning signal to say to the Congress and the political aristocracy, "You must change."

When we see 70 percent, 75 percent, and 80 percent support for term limitation, when we see the article last week by George Will in which he came out for term limitation and said that he had changed his mind, he had been wrong, and that watching the Philadelphia City Council and watching the U.S. Congress had convinced him there is a political aristocracy, and that it is inclined to be entrenched, and that it will not change or reform itself. But what we are being told, those of us who love the House, is that we better clean up the system, we better create a Congress we can be proud of, and we had better create a standard of honest self-government or the American people, in as crude a manner as necessary, are going to force traumatic, radical change, because they are fed up.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGRICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

□ 1800

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to commend the gentleman for doing this special order. I was at-

tending a meeting of about 10 or 15 other Congressmen in a Member's office and caught just a little bit of what the gentleman was talking about and wanted to come over and reinforce what he has just said.

You know, most of the Members, I would say all of the Members that run for Congress, do so for the best of reasons. I remember the night that I was elected back in 1984, how proud I was to be a Member-elect and how I was looking forward to coming to join this body with great pride, and my family and my friends and all of our supporters.

Quite honestly, I must say today that I am still proud to be a Member of the House of Representatives, but I do not think the American people are very proud of the House of Representatives. We have got to do something within ourselves, the current membership, to begin to address some of the fundamental problems. If we do not, the people are going to lose total credibility in this body as an institution, and if that happens, we have got serious problems as a nation.

I do not have an action plan for the Member from Georgia tonight, but I am mulling several things in my mind to try to begin to address some of the problems the gentleman has been speaking of. I do have an acronym though. I do have a name for it. I think we ought to start a "get real" club in the Congress, and "get real" would stand for "genuine effort to reform every American's Legislature," which is the House of Representatives, the U.S. Congress. I think that the American people want us to get real. I think they are tired of the U.S. Congress living a lifestyle that the average American cannot relate to.

I think the American people expect, especially Members of the House, which is the people's body, to be of the people, by the people, and for the people—and not above the people, beyond the people, and out of touch with the people.

So I just wanted to come over and commend the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] for having the intestinal fortitude to address Members of the body about some of the fundamental problems.

I certainly look forward to working with the gentleman to provide some of the solutions and hopefully we can do this very quickly. I do not think there is much time left ticking on the clock.

Mr. GINGRICH. I appreciate the gentleman's comments, because I think the fact is that this should not necessarily be a partisan effort, but the fact is that every Member who cares, and I like the gentleman's "get real club," genuine effort to reform every American's Legislature. Is that correct?

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Right; right.

Mr. GINGRICH. Just so we make sure that I have this down pat here. That is,



it seems to me, what people want back home. People do not expect miracles. I think baby boomers are growing up. They are now old enough, they pay credit cards. A lot of them have had children. They have seen life. They understand that everything is flawed and everything has limitations, and that even if, as Reagan said, we have every right to dream heroic dreams, we also recognize that the dream of the house we are going to own may not quite end up being the house we own, but it is a pretty good step in the right direction.

I think, similarly, people do not expect the Legislature to be perfect, and people do not expect legislators to be perfect. But they do expect us to establish a standard to which the wise and the honest may repair. They do expect us to set the patriotic needs of the Nation above the personal convenience of the politician, and I would hope that we could, in the next few weeks, respond not by hunkering down and hoping the press will go away and hoping the public will forget it and moving on, not by waiting for the next scandal to blow up or the next big news story to break, but, instead, I would hope on a bipartisan basis that those Members who care about honest self-government could begin to really work together, not trying to chase all the problems, because I do not think you are ever going to solve problems in this Congress by running around after each minor problem.

I think, instead, you have got to set a standard. You have got to decide what is fair, what is a reasonable principle, and a standard is not just about things like banking accounts or things like travel or things like parking or all the things you see in the paper. It is also standards of what legislatively should you expect. What would an honest, accountable, open legislature look like?

I think, interestingly, there have been at least two great waves of reform in this century. The Progressive Movement, about 1902 to about 1914, had a tremendous impact on the Congress.

The discharge petition we still have is an example of that. It is interesting to watch how a generation of reform gradually decays. The original discharge petition, when passed by the Progressives in the rebellion against Speaker Joe Cannon in 1910, required one signature. Any Member could walk in and say, "I want that bill to come to the floor," sign it, and it would be discharged. Gradually they decided that one was too few. Then it required 100 signatures. Then it required 218. Then they made it secret. Over about a 24-year period, there was a gradual drying up of the initial Progressive impulse toward openness, and it became a more controllable system, the one we have today.

Maybe one of the things that I have been thinking about is to require 100

signatures to discharge a bill, and the petition is open, so it is out in the public where people can see it, and if your Member tells you he is for the bill, you can see whether or not he signed the discharge.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, I think the gentleman is aware and participated in the discharge process in the last session of Congress which, for only the second time in history, we were able to get the balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution onto the floor, and that took really two sessions worth of effort to be successful in the last session, and I think the gentleman's reform about 100 signatures and making it an open process would be a tremendous step in the right direction, if you get 100 Members willing to sign their name that something should be considered, that is approximately one-fourth of the House of Representatives, and that is certainly a significant enough percentage of the body that the issue should be heard.

I think the gentleman well knows that many issues that the American people support are never reported on or debated on the House floor simply because the majority, for whatever reason, bottles them up in committee, and they are never even heard.

So I think that is a great idea.

Mr. GINGRICH. That is only one of many, many things we could do to open up the process to give the average American a much better chance to have influence and impact here in the Congress.

There is a second wave of reform. The Progressives were from about 1902 to about 1914. Then the Congress went along stabilized for a long stretch, and then in 1974, the Democrats elected a class who came in as real reformers, and as one of them said in an Atlantic Monthly article about a year ago, they arrived as real reformers, and within 6 months they turned into survivors. But there was a brief period where there was a real burst of reform effort and change in the power structure of the House, change in some of the rules, so we do know that it is possible in this century to change things. We do know that the American people can have an impact. We do know that if people are aroused and are positive, they can make things happen.

I want to emphasize two points here. The first is that I think our primary effort ought to be positive, not negative. It should be to design the architecture of the Congress we would be proud of, not to tear down the system that currently exists.

I think, frankly, that if we could state clearly enough a positive vision of representation, the current model would fall away of its own weight, and we would find ourselves in a much more positive, much healthier, much more desirable future.

Second, I think, has to be an effort on our part to arouse the American people. I want to say this directly to every person who might be listening or who might later on read this, the great enemy of honesty and decency and representation in America is not the Democrats and it is not the Republicans. It is cynicism and despair. The great enemy of truly reforming and changing and improving Capitol Hill is not the professional politician. It is not the PAC's. And it is not the unions. And it is not businesses. It is the voter, the potential American voter, who gripes when they watch the evening news and does nothing, who complains at Sunday lunch and does not register to vote, who goes down to the local bar and talks with great contempt about Congress but does not even register.

You know, if every citizen who got mad in the last 2 weeks about the Sergeant at Arms story would go register, if they would commit themselves to voting next year, if they would engage themselves to run for an office if they cannot find anybody else available to run, then you would have a new generation of fresh blood and fresh energy and fresh activity, but the great problem those of us who want to reform the system have faced is, you cannot reform a system from within. It is just not the nature of how it happens.

You have to arouse a grassroots groundswell of support, and then you have to have people who are willing to go register to vote, who are willing to put on bumper stickers, put up yard signs, give money, walk door-to-door, to make a difference for their candidate.

I am not speaking of this as a partisan Republican; whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or a Libertarian, whatever your background is, the way in a free society you change the society is to get active, to do the things that count.

Unlike Russia, we are not asking you to go down and get on a tank like Boris Yeltsin had to do, we are not asking you to physically surround our Capitol Building like they had to surround the Russian Parliament, we are just saying to you that if you truly want to change the place, whatever party you want to belong to, whatever your ideology, you cannot change it if all you do is gripe. You have got to be willing to register to vote and get active and be active.

Mr. BARTON of Texas. If the gentleman will yield further, I would agree with most of that.

I would say that those of us who are in the body need to begin the process within right now, acknowledging that you have to have the grassroots support and the outside influence. I think we have an obligation as current Members to begin that process immediately.

□ 1810

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, I did not mean to imply that we do not have a major

obligation. I think our first obligation is to understand as people who have served here, to think through and to create a standard, a standard of honest self-government and a standard of a Congress that we can be proud of, that we know is realistic, is honorable and is something that can be done.

I think if we were to establish that standard that our job then would be to try to move the specific pieces of reform, to try to encourage all 435 Members to join in on a nonpartisan basis to try to change what is going on.

Then I think people at home could first of all see a positive vision. They could see a heroic dream of representative self-government. They could see an opportunity to be involved in a truly positive experience.

Second, I believe at that point people at home could monitor our progress. They could call their Congressman. They could go to their town hall meetings. They could write letters to their editors or be involved in their radio call-in show. They could begin to help communicate that having an honest, responsible, orderly, decent system that you could be proud of, that you could show your children and your grandchildren and you could say that is the Congress of the United States and I am proud of it.

I think that vision, that model, is something that the gentleman and I and others, both in the Democratic and Republican Parties, need to work together in the next few weeks and lay it out here in a positive way, explain the Congress that could be and then begin a methodical process of trying to pass the reforms, to pass the activities that would make that possible.

Let me just say in closing, Mr. Speaker, that I think these broad concepts, these general ideas, to my mind, I am trying to make just three or four simple straightforward points.

First, that all of us who love the Congress and love the process of American democracy and believe in the vision that our Founding Fathers had of honest self-government, all of us have an obligation not to run and hide, not to be defensive, not to be ashamed, but instead to step up and say, "All right, you are correct. The system as it is currently run is not the system we ought to have. Let's define in a positive way what that system ought to be."

Second, all of us have an obligation to talk it out, to think it through and to make it a mature, responsible, realistic system of self-government, to be willing to say publicly this is what we would implement. This is what we believe would work; not just political speeches, not just grandstanding and maneuvering, but the real reforms we are prepared to live by.

Third, our real job is to gather a positive level of support in a positive way to build up a positive Congress.

Frankly, the decaying and the corrupt and the confused and the inappropriate will tear themselves down if we can build a positive model and we can move in that direction.

Last, I would say to those of my friends, already serving in the Congress, to those staffs who already work here, in the long run I do not think we have a choice. Our choice is not running and hiding and hoping the news media will forget us, because the American public through the term limitation effort, through the radio call-in shows, through the newspapers, they are telling us they are unhappy. They are the ultimate customer. They are the citizens who are sovereign, and they are telling us this is not the way they want Capitol Hill run.

We only have two choices. We can hunker down and wait until the force of public opinion and the force of popular outrage is so great that it just shatters the current institution, or we can form a partnership with the American people. We can form something like the Get Real Club and have a genuine effort to reform every American's legislature, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON], has said, and together we can change things in a positive, healthy, mature, adult manner.

I wanted to come before you tonight because I, like everyone else for 2 weeks, have been negative and depressed and defensive and down and angry and frustrated and all the emotions I have heard from all of my colleagues. I just think we ought to put that behind us. We ought to quit being defensive. We ought to roll up our sleeves. We ought to accept the fact that "it ain't been good enough." We ought to go out there and say to the American people, "We hear you and we are going to change it and we are going to clean it up and you are going to be proud of this institution and we are going to give you the kind of Congress that you can bring your family and your children and your church and your neighborhood and your synagogue and you can come right here and you can say that is the House of Representatives and that is the U.S. Congress, and I am proud of the people who serve me and that is what America ought to be like."

So I just want to come tonight and say that the time has come to establish a positive standard of honest self-government. The time has come to establish a Congress you can be proud of, and I hope that every Democrat and every Republican and our one socialist friend who serves here will all agree to reach beyond partisanship. Let us set a firm, positive standard, and let us get on with the business of representing America.

## THE CONTINUING CRISIS IN YUGOSLAVIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Maryland [Mrs. BENTLEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, another Yugoslav cease-fire is in effect the seventh in a very short period of time and we can hope that the bloody sage of a ruthless civil war is coming to an end. Over the past few weeks a number of Members of both Chambers of this Congress have made statements and introduced resolutions that show a lack of understanding about the roots of the Yugoslav crisis, and I would like to take this opportunity to set the historical record straight.

It is too easy, Mr. Speaker, to point the finger at the Yugoslav Federal Army and ethnic Serbs since these forces at present hold the edge in military gains. I suggest that such finger pointing historically is inaccurate and morally wrong.

One major issue stands in the way of peace for Yugoslavia. The Republic of Croatia, which wishes to, and should have the right to secede from Yugoslavia, has a population of nearly 1 million Serbs, according to Metropolitan Jovan of the Serbian Orthodox Church, whose diocese is Ljubljana in Slovenia and Zagreb in Croatia.

Some 600,000 of these Serbs live in regions of Croatia near the Serbian border on lands that are overwhelmingly populated by Serbs, a historical fact that has existed for many centuries. These lands are known as Krajina and Slavonia.

The Serbs living in Croatia argue that if Croatia has the right to self-determination, the right to destroy Yugoslavia's international border, so that Croats will live in a Croatian land, then the overwhelming Serbian populated regions of Croatia have the same right of self-determination to live in a Serbian land.

The Croats counter that they have the right to destroy Yugoslav borders, an internationally recognized boundary line, but that the borders of their own Republic are sacred. Mr. Speaker, this kind of thinking is contradictory, and I would take the time now to show why it is so.

I begin my refuting a common claim that we have been hearing that equates freedom for Croatia with that of the Baltic States. The Baltic States, Mr. Speaker, were forcefully and illegally incorporated into the Soviet Union following World War II. The United States never recognized this illegal act, and without contradiction today recognizes the Baltic States as independent nations.

Yugoslavia, however, exists as the voluntary, and I repeat, voluntary, formation of a nation-state by the Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes on November 28, 1918. This nation is and has been recog-



nized as a nation-state throughout this century. There is no possible comparison between the Baltic States and Croatia in its bid for independence.

When President Mesic of Yugoslavia was here some 2 weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, he said that the formation of Yugoslavia and the Kingdom of Croatia-Slovenian Serbs in 1918, was done under duress. I remarked to him that he and I apparently did not read the same history books.

□ 1820

Mr. Speaker, I have now and I am going to read the Yugoslav Manifesto to the British nation, which was written on May 12 of 1915, and the Yugoslav Manifesto says:

Austria-Hungary and Germany have imposed upon the Southern Slav nation a fratricidal civil war. Eight million Southern Slavs (Yugoslavs) are condemned to fight against their own brothers and liberators. Large numbers have been expelled from their native soil, or put to death, while the prisons are crowded with political victims.

Today the Yugoslav people cannot give expression to its wishes; its representative assemblies are closed, many of its deputies are in prison or subjected to a rigorous surveillance.

Those of our young men who succeeded in escaping are fighting in the ranks of the Serbian and Montenegrin Armies. We, who at the outbreak of war happened to be abroad, feel it to be our bounden duty to acquaint the civilized world, and above all the British nation, with the true sentiments and aspirations of our people. Our Yugoslav brothers in America, meeting last March at Chicago in a Congress of 563 delegates, have unanimously adopted our programme.

The Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes pray for the victory of the Triple Entente and confidently await from it the salvation of the Yugoslav nation. The conviction that the Triple Entente is fighting for the triumph of the principle of nationality inspired the moral energy and superhuman efforts of Serbia and Montenegro, and prevented their kinsmen along the frontier from utterly losing heart.

For Serbia and Montenegro this war is one of self-defence and liberation, not of conquest; they are fighting to emancipate our people from a foreign yoke and to unite them as a single free nation. The military and political overthrow of Austria-Hungary will for ever put an end to that system of "Divide et Impera" by which our people has for centuries been governed. The Yugoslavs form a single nation, alike by identity of language, by the unanswerable laws of geography and by national consciousness. Only if united will they possess the resources necessary for an independent existence.

The Yugoslavs (Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes) inhabit the following countries: the Kingdoms of Serbia and Montenegro; the Triune Kingdom of Croatia-Slavonia-Dalmatia (with Fiume and district); the provinces of Bosnia, Herzegovina, and Carniola; considerable portions of the provinces of Istria, Trieste, Gorizia-Gradiška, Carinthia, and Styria; and, finally, the Yugoslav zone of Hungary proper.

To perpetuate the disunion of these territories by leaving so many under Austro-Hungarian rule, or to transfer even portions of them to another alien rule, would be a flagrant violation of our ethnographical, geo-

graphical, and economic unity, and to this our people would unquestionably oppose an energetic and justifiable resistance.

The Southern Slav people aspires to unite its territories in a single independent State. The internal arrangements of the new State will be determined by the nation itself, in accordance with its own wishes and needs.

The Southern Slav State (Yugoslavia) will be an element of order and of peace. While devoting its whole energies to the cause of progress it will also develop those well-known virtues of its seafaring population which the British nation will be the first to appreciate. Its ports will be open to trade in a manner hitherto unknown, and through them a commercial outlet will be assured to all the nations of the hinterland, especially to the Czechs and the Magyars.

Our people, which professes several religions, and whose tolerant spirit is well known, will crown its national unity by guarantees of religious equality and complete freedom of worship. Sure of the goodwill of our Russian brothers we appeal also to the sympathies of their Western Allies in our struggle for liberty. And in thus appealing, as representatives of a democratic people, to the British nation and Parliament, we look for such support as shall enable the Yugoslav nation, after centuries of martyrdom, to achieve at length its unity and independence.

London, May 12.

This manifesto was signed by the following members of the Yugoslav Committee:

President: Dr. Ante Trumbic, Advocate, President of the Croat National Party in the Diet of Dalmatia, late Mayor of Split (Spalato) and late member for Zadar (Zara), in the Austrian Parliament.

Members: Dr. Ante Blankini (of Starigrad, Dalmatia), President of the Yugoslav Committee in Chicago, U.S.A.; Dr. Ivo de Giulli, Advocate, Town Councillor of Dubrovnik (Ragusa), Dalmatia; Dr. Julije Gazzari, Advocate, late Town Councillor of Sibenik (Sebenico), Dalmatia; Rev. Don Niko Grskovic, President of the Croatian League in Cleveland, U.S.A.; Dr. Hinko Hinkovic, Advocate, Member of the Croatian Parliament and Croatian Delegate to the Parliament of Budapest; Dr. Josip Jedlovski, Advocate, Secretary of the Slovene Society "Edinost" and of the Croat School Union in Trieste; Milan Marjanovic, of Kastav, Istria, Editor of Narodno Jedinstvo (National Unity), Zagreb (Agram), Croatia; Ivan Mestrovic, Sculptor, of Otavice, Dalmatia; Dr. Mice Micic, Advocate, Town Councillor of Dubrovnik (Ragusa), Dalmatia; Dr. Franko Potocnjak, Advocate, late Member of the Croatian Parliament and Delegate to the Parliament of Budapest; Dr. Niko Stojanovic, Advocate, Member of the Bosnian Diet; Frano Supilo, Editor of Novi List, Fiume, late Member of the Croatian Parliament and Delegate to the Parliament of Budapest; Mihajlo Pupin, of Pancevo, South Hungary, Professor at Columbia University, New York; Dusan Vasiljevic, Advocate, Mostar, Herzegovina, Vice-President of the Serb National Union of Bosnia; Dr. Nikola Zupanic, Publicist, of Metlika, Carniola.

Mr. Speaker, if one looks at a map of the nations of Yugoslavia published in the New York Times, Sunday, October 14, 1934, one sees even at this early date, the borders of Yugoslavia were firmly in place. Not so, however, for the borders of the Republics. The map shows that much of the land that today

is part of the Croatian Republic was not part of that Republic even decades after the national Yugoslav borders were in place.

The modern borders of the Croatian Republic were drawn after World War II by the dictator Tito, himself a Croat. Even then, Mr. Speaker, those Communists who disapproved of this arbitrary and autocratic fiat by Tito found themselves in exile on Goli Otak, or Bear Island, the Yugoslav version of Siberia.

Mr. Speaker, it shocks me that in light of this history, in light of recognized international law principles which put so much emphasis on the sanctity of national borders, that a member of this body could actually take the position that Croats have the right to destroy Yugoslavia's national borders but Serbs, living in lands overwhelmingly Serbian for centuries, have no rights, at the same time, even enjoy employment within those borders, let alone any freedom. Metropolitan Jovan questions whether he would be secure in Zagreb any more.

But, Mr. Speaker, the issue implicated in this conflict go much deeper. In this century, the Serbs of Croatia already have had one experience living in an independent Croatian state. That state was the Nazi Independent State of Croatia, a regime which butchered and gassed several hundreds of thousands of not only Serbians, but also Jews and Gypsies as well, a nation which declared war against the United States of America. The Ustase Croats were so brutal in their destruction of everything Serbian that it was reported at that time that even Hitler's SS officers were shocked by their actions.

If the Serbs seem unconcerned about Western Europe's sudden interest in the Yugoslav conflict of today, perhaps it is because they remember Europe's silence the last time Serbs lived in a Croatian state. No doubt they recall that while the Serbian Orthodox Patriarch was imprisoned in the Dachau concentration camp, Aborgy Stepinac, the Catholic Archbishop of Zagreb, blessed Nazi and Ustase troops. When Catholic Slovenes even protested this to Pope Pius XII, he too remained silent. The Serbs no doubt recall these dark days when the world deserted them, and today know that only in a Serbian state are they safe from a repetition of such horror.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, much of what I have just related may be called by many as old history, a chapter best closed in the enlightened modern world. Why do the Serbs not take this view? Let me share with the House my opinion on that question.

Croatian President Franjo Tudjman was elected on and has carried out a program of rabid Croatian nationalism

and anti-Serbianism. The new Croatian flag strongly resembles the old, Nazi-backed, Ustashe flag. Croatian Serbs are being denied the right to use the traditional Cyrillic alphabet. Serbs have been fired en masse from Government jobs. The Croatian Government now controls the Republic's largest newspaper publishing house and has sought to ban independent television programs viewed as anti-Croatian. And, Mr. Speaker, special Croatian military forces have adopted black uniforms reminiscent of Croatia's World War II fascist forces. The Ustashe "U" is frequently found where an Orthodox church has been destroyed.

I know, Mr. Speaker, some Serbian refugees in the United States today who fled Croatia out of fear for their lives. They tell tales of Serbian homes, businesses, and churches being destroyed and defaced. All of which reminds me of what happened to Serbs in Croatia between 1941 and 1945.

As Croatia's President, Franjo Tudjman is primarily responsible for Croatia's refusal to admit its part in the crimes it committed against the Serbs, Jews, and Gypsies during World War II, and is encouraging Croatia through propaganda and nationalistic speeches to repeat its dreadful role in history.

As my colleagues know, Mr. Speaker, I said to our State Department several months ago that the animosity that was building up between the Croats and the Serbs could be soft-pedaled and really may be even eliminated, if only, if only, there was some admission about the genocide, about the slaughter, that took place in 1941 to 1945, of some 1 million or more Serbs, Jews, and Gypsies who were slaughtered by the Ustashe. But they refused. In addition, as my colleagues know, even the Russians admitted what took place in Katyn Forest and apologized to the Poles, and the Nazis, the Germans, apologized for the actions of the Nazis to the Jews. But that is not taking place in Yugoslavia, and in fact to the contrary Mr. Tudjman is encouraging Croatia through nationalistic speeches to repeat its dreadful role in history.

Although monitored by the Wiesenthal Center of Croatia, he still insists that "Holocaust death figures have been exaggerated," and says that in the concentration camp of Jasenovac, the second largest camp in the Nazi system by the Wiesenthal Center's figures, where 750,000 Serbs, Jews, and Gypsies were put to death by the Croatia Ustashe regime, "only 30,000 died there."

These historical facts were handily swept aside by Croatian-born Tito and his Communist regime in the name of Yugoslavia, which "allowed Croatia and Slovenia to achieve the highest standard of living in the federation," and which allowed Croatian nationalism to fester.

Now Croatia, claiming it is an independent and democratic state, is at it again. I would like to share with you now a summary of comments given by His Eminence Metropolitan Jovan of Zagreb and Ljubljana today in a briefing on Capitol Hill.

In September 1991 Bishop Nikolai and his deacon, on the way to the funeral of His Holiness Patriarch German, were stopped and searched by the Croatian Special Police body near Sibenik. While they were being searched others of the police shouted, "Why are you searching them? Why don't you just let me kill them?"

Several months ago the residence and cathedral of Bishop Lucijan of Slavonia, located in Pakrac, were ransacked by the Croatian Special Police. The residence was turned into a barracks and the cathedral into a munitions storehouse and artillery nest. In September, on his way back from the funeral of Patriarch German, the bishop was detained by the Croatian Special Police and held naked in the courtyard of the police building for several hours. On October 4 His Grace was taken by the Croatian police. His whereabouts are unknown.

After Easter of this year in the town of Sisak, explosives were thrown at doors of the church, damaging it so badly that it is now unusable. The church walls were scribbled with "we are ustasha" and "death to the Serbs," and a Croatian organization threatened to kill the Serbian Orthodox priest if he did not leave.

Mr. Speaker, please note that some of these crimes took place before Croatia declared its independence; that is, before the Croats supposedly were attacked by the so-called Serbian guerrillas.

Mr. Speaker, these atrocities and attacks on the Serb Orthodox Church have not been related there by our press.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel I must present this story for the RECORD and also discuss the documented crimes.

#### DOCUMENTED CRIMES COMMITTED AGAINST THE SERBIAN POPULATION AND THE MEMBERS OF THE YUGOSLAV PEOPLE'S ARMY IN CROATIA

SEPTEMBER 17, 1991

In the area of Oaljek, members of the Croatian National Guard deliberately fired on an army ambulance which was clearly marked with a red cross. In the course of the attack, the wounded Yugoslav army soldier being transported to a military hospital died, and the ambulance driver was wounded.

#### SEPTEMBER 18, 1991—MURDERING OF THE WOUNDED

Pilot Captain Zlatko Nuspahic was brought down on September 18, 1991, over the Petrinje army base, where he was helping to break the blockade of the Vasilj Gacesa barracks. The pilot succeeded in bailing out of the aircraft, but was wounded after he had reached the ground. To his misfortune, he parachuted into an area controlled by the Croatian police and National Guard. Instead of coming to the aid of the wounded pilot, the ustasi horde murdered him with a hail of

bullets into his stomach. After the pilot died, they took off his clothes and robbed the body of all valuables, credit cards and documents.

His naked body was left on the ground for eight days before he was transported to the pathology department of the Sisak Hospital. Zlatko Nuspahic's body was in such a state it took two days to complete his identification, using all modern pathological methods.

SEPTEMBER 21, 1991

In the area of the village of Mirkovci, at 1740 hours, the Croatian police and National Guard opened fire against an unarmed Air Force helicopter which was transporting the wounded. The helicopter was damaged, and one crew member lightly wounded.

These three cases represent a grave violation of the humanitarian rules of armed combat and at the same time a violation of Protocol II on the protection of victims of non-international (internal) armed conflicts, ratified and signed by Yugoslavia, which is binding on all participants in armed conflicts.

#### SLAUGHTER OF ARMY RESERVISTS

Under the command of reserve Captain Mile Peuraca, 23 servicemen from the barracks at Mekusje, near Karlovac, left in two vehicles for the Stjepan Milasincic-Siljo barracks at Logoriste, 5 km. from Karlovac.

At the Korana bridge, virtually in the centre of Karlovac, the vehicles were stopped by a group of policemen, who asked the soldiers to surrender. Captain Peuraca refused to do so and demanded to be allowed to proceed to their destination or to return to their barracks. Neither of these proposals was accepted, whereupon Captain Peuraca suggested that the police forces should negotiate the surrender with the superior army command. This proposal was also rejected, and the army men were given 45 minutes to surrender. While the talks were in progress, the men started surrendering for unknown reasons.

In the meantime, three tanks were sent out from the Mekusje barracks to come to the aid of the surrounded men. About 500 metres from the point of ambush, the tanks fired warning shots in the air. The ustasi commander sent one of the disarmed soldiers to demand that the tanks cease their fire, or else all the men who had surrendered would be killed. In the face of this threat, the tanks stopped firing, but in the meantime the ustasas had received their own reinforcements. These ustasas were dressed in battle fatigues with stockings drawn over their faces. After this group's arrival all the army men surrendered.

They were ordered to lay down their arms and to lie face down, hands behind their heads. The last one to be led to the bridge was Captain Peuraca. An ustasi assassin stabbed him in the back twice with a knife. The captain fell, and the ustasas fired at the men's legs to prevent them from running away. Then they began sadistically brutalizing the helpless soldiers. They cut off their ears, gouged out their eyes, and mutilated their faces with knives. The soldiers were slashed with knives all over their bodies, and each one had his throat cut.

The ustasas took particular pleasure in lacerating the body of the active army lieutenant, Nikola Babic. Every part of his body was cut up; his eyes were gouged out; the skin was flayed off a part of his face; his ears were cut, and his head was almost entirely severed off his body.

The slaughtered men were Jovan Sipic (1966), Bozo Kozlina (1954), Nabojša Popovic



(1967), Milic Savic (1959), Milenko Lukac (1959), Nikola Babic (1948), Slobodan Milovanovic (1966), Svetozar Gokovic (1959), Milos Srdic (1948), Zoran Komadine (1964), Mile Babic (1949), Vaso Bizic (1956), and Mile Leuraca (1964). Of the 13 murdered young men, seven were the only sons of their parents.

As the ustasas opened fire, Branko Madjarac, Dusan Mrkic, and Svetozar Sarac threw themselves off the bridge into the Korana river below. Madjarac managed to reach the barracks, while the other two are in the Karlovac Hospital. The fate of the remaining seven men is not known.

SEPTEMBER 22, 1991

In an attempt to seize the blockaded barracks at Sibenik, the armed forces of the Republic of Croatia made use of chemical weapons. They forcibly brought to the gates the wives and children of the besieged officers, in an attempt to blackmail them into surrendering.

These two incidents constitute a grave violation of the Geneva Convention and are regarded as war crimes which are prohibited at any time and at any place.

The armed attacks against the barracks at Vinkovci have gone on unabated for fifteen days. Not even the removal of the dead and evacuation of the wounded have been permitted.

SEPTEMBER 25, 1991

Following an agreement between the Federal Secretary for National Defense and the President of the Republic of Croatia on the evacuation of dead and wounded from the Vinkovci army base, a convoy of army ambulances left Vinkovci at 1940 hours. Immediately after leaving the barracks, the convoy was blocked by 150 members of the Croatian National Guard. They abused and mistreated the wounded and the attendants; they tore the bandages off the wounded; they dragged the surgeon out of his vehicle, knocked him to the ground and pressed a knife against his throat, threatening to kill him. They dragged Major Dragan Ljubisic out of his vehicle and took him away. Any interference in aiding the wounded is a serious violation of the Geneva Convention.

SEPTEMBER 26, 1991—CRIMES AGAINST THE CIVILIAN POPULATION

Ustasas from the Croatian village of Maras, under the cover of thick fog at 0400 hours, entered the village of Brlog, firing indiscriminately with all their weapons. Led by the local Croats, who knew every house in the village and who served as guides, they began plundering and setting fire to the houses belonging to Serbs. Their cattle, tractors and all valuable property were taken away. All 80 Serbian houses in the village were burned down and destroyed; only 48 houses were spared, which belonged to villagers of the Croatian nationality or to households with mixed marriages.

Most of the Serbian populace, some 100 people, had taken refuge in the hills that night and this is what saved them. Of the Serbs who happened to stay behind in the village, at least 10 were murdered, and as many were taken away. Djuro Tomic and his sister Soka Tomic, Petar Prica, Petar Vrankovic age 72, Dragan Kosovac age 61, and others who managed to escape this hell, are witnesses of the horrible crimes committed.

They were quite certain that the brothers Bojko and Mico Orlovic, who were sick and housebound, were burnt to death in the courtyard garage.

In respect to the inhabitants of the hamlet of Puhalo, which took its name after them,

witnesses say they were tied with wire to the house of their Croatian neighbours and then led away to an unknown destination. The missing include Danko Puhalo, nicknamed Rus, and his wife. The households of all the well-to-do Serbs in the area were completely destroyed. Similarly, Vujo, Dika and Nada Puhalo were led away and their homes were demolished.

The Serbian refugees claim that the ustasas were led by the former policeman Mate Majkerovic, truck driver Stipe Niksic, Vinko Ivanisevic, Jozo Maras and Mijat Kajtes.

SEPTEMBER 29, 1991—ACTION AGAINST BUILDINGS PROTECTED AS NATIONAL HERITAGE

The Croatian ustasi forces opened mortar fire at the monastery of Badjani, on the left bank of the Danube, which is in the territory of the Republic of Serbia.

There were no military forces or army installations anywhere in the vicinity of the monastery.

SEPTEMBER 30, 1991

In the village of Hrvace near Sinj, army conscript Goran Plavsic was captured and brutally murdered.

TREATMENT OF THE DEAD

Colonel Dragutin Petkovic can testify to the inhumane treatment of the dead.

Members of the Croatian National Guard laid out dead bodies on the roads expected to be used by the army tank convoys, correctly calculating that the army men would not drive their tanks over them. When the troops attempted to remove the bodies, they were fired on.

On the outskirts of the village of Jankovci, they placed a dead body on the road and put a booby trap under the corpse.

ROBBING OF PRISONERS

The prison officials at Ozijak forced under duress the imprisoned officers of the Tuzla Corps to sign all the blank checks of the Post Office Savings Bank they had on them. This fact was corroborated by Radizm Stamanic, Zarko Djekic, Dragoslav Predolac, Srecko Prekosavec, Ahmet Jumerovski and others.

Clearly the intention was to cash the checks, thus robbing the detained officers of their savings. The prison officials said that it was to recover "war damages" which the army units had inflicted in the territory of Croatia.

□ 1840

Mr. Speaker, I felt we had to get these things in the RECORD, because we are hearing nothing about the atrocities against the Serbians in our media. The media, the press, all seem to be a public relations war on the part of the Croats. There is nothing on the other side. As I said, Mr. Speaker, two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. Speaker, just this week we did hear that the palace of President Franjo Tudjman was bombed by the Yugoslav Army. There is a lot of speculation as to whether that actually took place or did not take place.

I am saying that whoever did it was wrong, and the United States should send over its military investigative units to determine what actually happened there, and that the perpetrators of that crime should be properly punished.

Mr. Speaker, in today's Toronto Globe Mail, a very outstanding newspaper, there is an editorial on this situation in Yugoslavia. The last paragraph says,

The outside powers should intervene to help broker a lasting solution. This will be terribly difficult. It may involve border changes, property division and even large population transfers. But there is no alternative. Croatia will have its independence; the Serbian minority will have no part of it. That much has been clear since the referendums of May.

Mr. Speaker, is there any reason why the Serbs of Croatia, in light of history both recent, and of the past half-century, do not want to live in the independent state of Croatia where Ustashe seems to be active again? Is there any doubt why the Croatian Serbs are willing to fight before allowing this to happen?

□ 1850

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS AND TRANSPORTATION AND COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. PETER J. VISCLOSKEY, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 9, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker of the House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I respectfully resign my seats on the Public Works and Transportation Committee and the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

I appreciate the opportunities and courtesies afforded to me by my colleagues on these committees.

With kind regards, I am  
Sincerely,

PETER J. VISCLOSKEY,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Georgia). Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from Hon. NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 9, 1991.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,  
Speaker of the House,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to my election to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee by the Democratic Caucus, I hereby resign my seat on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Thank you.  
Sincerely,

NEIL ABERCROMBIE,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, October 9, 1991.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Due to my election to the Interior Committee by the Democratic Caucus, I hereby resign my seat on the Small Business Committee.

Sincerely,

CALVIN DOOLEY,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

#### THE WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join in support of the Women's Economic Equity Act of 1991, legislation which promotes economic advancement and equity for women in the workplace and at home.

Over the last 20 years women have entered the work force in record numbers. By the year 2000, two out of every three new entrants into the work force will be women. Though women are welcomed into the workplace, many must still contend with lower wages, barriers to high-skilled and technical jobs, the lack of promotions and no health benefits.

Today, women workers earn only 71 cents for every \$1 men earn; women constitute 62 percent of the work force with poverty level incomes; almost 45 percent of families with children under 18 are maintained by single women and live in poverty; and 14 percent of all women workers have no health insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, as the fastest growing segment of our work force, women deserve equal pay, equal treatment, and equal opportunity to advance to highly skilled, well paying jobs.

The Women's Economic Equity Act is comprised of 25 bills that address increased educational and employment opportunities, business ownership, economic justice, and retirement equity.

It provides technical assistance to organizations in eliminating discriminatory wage-setting practices, and establishes a council within the legislative branch to consider Federal policy with respect to the economic problems of women, particularly those living in poverty.

The act seeks to create new employment opportunities for women through increased job training and education. It includes legislation I authored to expand Pell grant eligibility for 6 million students who attend college on a less-than-half-time basis, the majority of whom are

women. For these women—undereducated, working, many with children—education is the only means to economic self-sufficiency.

Mr. Speaker these issues addressed by the Women's Economic Equity Act are important not only to women, but to all families, employers, and communities across the Nation. The economic well-being of America is dependent on a work force in which women are accepted and considered equal.

Mr. Speaker, women deserve equity in the workplace, in our communities, and in our Nation. I urge my colleagues to support the Women's Economic Equity Act.

#### TRIBUTE TO MILES DAVIS

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

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to commemorate and celebrate the contributions of one of our country's all-time greatest musicians, jazz or otherwise, Miles Davis.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like my colleagues to know that I am not a jazz expert. I just know what I like, and I know what moves me. And Miles Davis moved me throughout my life.

He also moved many millions of Americans and people all over the world. When I was an 11- or 12-year-old beginning trumpet player, I first heard Miles Davis play. I could not believe that someone could bring the often cold and brassy trumpet down to something so warm, so soft, and so sweet.

In my house our lights went out at 10 o'clock, and I remember bringing my little radio underneath the covers and waiting—listening to, I think it was a jazz symphony with Sid—just waiting, and waiting and waiting until a Miles Davis number would come up. Often it would be late and after that I would fall asleep real easy.

The unmistakable, almost human voice-like quality, the cutting, piercing yet quiet tone, the muted horn that cried out with sadness, loneliness, and love, the sparseness of the music, the efficiency of the notes from Miles' horn, each note meant so much.

Others could triple tongue, extend their range into the far reaches or display more manual dexterity, but nobody, nobody ever has, and probably ever will, play a more beautiful horn than Miles Davis.

Can one imagine, can one imagine how much joy, how much pleasure, how much sadness, how much feeling, how much passion he brought to so many over so many years, about 50.

Mr. Speaker, Miles Davis was a musical innovator who would forge a trail only to leave it as soon as others started to follow, and then he would go off on some new trail where others would follow again, and then a new trail.

He usually left his previous trail before his audience even appreciated what he had done. It all started back

around 1944, when he played bebop with legends of jazz Charlie Parker, and Dizzy Gillespie. They recognized his incredible ability early.

Miles Davis entered the big time at 18 years of age. After a year at the famous Juilliard School of Music in Manhattan, Miles Davis went back to the jazz clubs. In 1948 he began the move towards a more elaborately orchestrated cerebral sound, cool jazz. It was Miles who innovated cool jazz. He did it with a 9-piece band, including Gerry Mulligan, Lee Konitz, and John Lewis, all legends in their own right. He recorded the revolutionary album "The Birth of the Cool," each of these musicians were first rate on their own instruments and in composing.

After a struggle with substance abuse in the early 1950's, Miles Davis rose again in 1954 and introduced the world to hard bop, a new spare, driving jazz sound. He played it with saxophonist, tenor saxophonist, Sonny Rollins and pianists Horace Silver and Thelonius Monk.

□ 1900

Those who know jazz know these names, their contributions and their greatness.

In 1955, Miles Davis wowed the jazz world at the Newport Jazz Festival with his piece "Round Midnight," a Thelonius Monk tune, and in the same year he began his illustrious career recording at Columbia Records.

Just a word on the album which was entitled "Round About Midnight." It featured John Coltrane on tenor sax, Red Garland on piano, who shared an interest in boxing with Miles Davis; Philly Joe Jones on drums and Paul Chambers on base, again a super all-star group. And Miles debuted his legendary Columbia career, as I mentioned, with this set, and it's the title of a Thelonius Monk classic entitled "Round About Midnight." It was recorded with this quintet, and I mentioned John Coltrane who was kind of a personal find of Miles Davis, and it was done in their second year in existence. It sent new shock waves through the jazz world, and this album really found Miles Davis hitting his stride as the master of the trumpet.

During the years 1958 to 1960 Miles Davis recorded two wonderful albums, "Porgy and Bess" in 1958 and "Sketches of Spain" in 1959 and 1960. The orchestration of these symphonic jazz albums was done by a man named Gil Evans, and it was brilliant. Who could ever forget in Porgy and Bess the moaning, crying, desperate plea that Miles played out in the song "I Love You Porgy"? And what about the happy, high-stepping sound of "Gonna Have a Good Time in New York"?

Who could ever listen to the strains of Spanish color and Spanish sadness, the cut-to-the-quick Spain that is "Concierto de Aranjuez" on the



"Sketches of Spain" album and not feel transported into the very essence of that country, Spain, its history, its personality, its passion, its music? Miles Davis, along with symphonic jazz arranger Gil Evans did just that. It is amazing how he could pick up the feel of this country and its culture and deliver it out to the American people via the jazz idiom.

Nowhere, and at no time have I ever felt closer to the Spain I knew than through Miles Davis' music. Never have I appreciated Gershwin as I did through Miles Davis' "Porgy and Bess" solos.

By 1959 Miles had left hard bop and symphonic jazz behind for a music based on modal changes rather than chords, a jazz with static, stripped-down harmonies that he played with pianist Bill Evans. His recording of "Kind of Blue" defined his style through the 1960's.

I will tell Members a little bit about "Kind of Blue." Again, it had John Coltrane on tenor saxophone, Bill Evans on piano, James Cobb on drums, Paul Chambers on base, Cannonball Adderly on alto sax, and Wynton Kelly on piano.

Let me quote from Bill Evans and what he wrote in 1955, pianist Gil Evans, about this particular album because it was brilliant, and it was spontaneous. It was the best in spontaneity that you can find in jazz in perhaps a century.

Bill Evans said:

As the painter needs his framework of parchment, the improvising musical group needs its framework in time. Miles Davis presents here frameworks which are exquisite in their simplicity and yet contain all that is necessary to stimulate performance with a sure reference to the primary conception.

Miles conceived these settings only hours before the recording dates and arrived with sketches which indicated to the group what was to be played. Therefore, you will hear something close to pure spontaneity in these performances. The group had never played these pieces prior to the recordings and I think without exception the first complete performance of each was a "take."

That means it was recorded.

By 1963, Miles was exploring still newer territory with pianist Herbie Hancock, bassist Ron Carter and Tony Williams on drums. This new, innovative form stressed the interplay between soloist and rhythm section, and it was soon widely imitated.

In the late 1960's Miles introduced electric instruments into jazz, setting off the movement that fused rock rhythm with jazz-like improvisation. His double album "Bitches Brew" sold 500,000 copies and sent repercussions throughout the world of music. That was a lot of albums sold for a jazz album.

By the 1970's Miles was plagued with more health and drug problems, but continued to experiment, this time

with funk music, stressing bass and percussion.

Mr. Speaker, Miles Davis was hard on himself as a musician, he was hard on those around him, including his live audiences. I can remember one time at the Village Vanguard in New York City when he played eight bars and kind of stormed off the stage, and we did not see him again for the rest of the evening almost. And I was upset. I was kind of mad and I felt cheated. But when I went home, I still listened to that music. It did not diminish the quality of his music in my eyes and in my heart.

But Miles Davis was also one of the greatest judges and promoters of new talent in jazz. He really knew excellence when he heard it, and the people he played with, and he brought along, that he brought into jazz constitute a Who's Who of the last 50 years of jazz. Just think of the people he played with and the people he brought in: Dizzy Gillespie on trumpets, Charlie Parker on alto sax, Gerry Mulligan on baritone sax, Lee Knott and Cannonball Adderly on alto sax, Sonny Rollins and John Coltrane on tenor sax, pianists John Lewis, Horace Silver, Thelonius Monk, Bill Evans, Herbie Hancock, and Ron Carter on base and Tony Williams on drums. It is a virtual jazz hall of fame, and Miles was the No. 1 hall of famer.

Miles took a lot of criticism for his enigmatic, reclusive, and sometimes combative public personality. But his aloofness may have been due to his intense focus on his music and his penchant for privacy. At concerts he simply was not concerned with the audience but with the music and with the musicians. In fact, he once said it very clearly, he did not hide this. He said I play for myself and the musicians that I play with.

Mr. Speaker, in the end, the magnificence of Miles Davis's music overcame the frustrations of his public. In his hands, the trumpet became his unique, human voice that he gave to many generations of Americans and people all over the world. No one will ever play that instrument like Miles Davis did. He advanced the jazz idiom like few others in this century. He offered his art in a focused, quiet, and reflective way.

At a time in music, Mr. Speaker, when louder is more and more is better, Miles Davis offers the American people a route to come home a little bit, come home to a kind of comfort and calm reward to the psyche and soul that simplicity and natural beauty deliver.

I would urge my colleagues and fellow Americans to take a good, close listen to the live works of Miles Davis.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to yield to the gentleman from Detroit, the Honorable JOHN CONYERS, who also shared a great love for the music of Miles Davis.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I begin this special order by commending my colleague and friend from Pennsylvania, Mr. RITTER, who not only took the initiative to make sure that the Congress had this special order to remember this unique contributor to our culture, but who has proceeded to put into the RECORD a description of Miles Davis that covers several parts of this very complex human being. First of all, the personal, human Miles Davis, and then the musical analysis of Miles Davis, of how he evolved, what his music went through in different stages, and I must say that I listened with rapt attention as my colleague amazed me with his erudition and his understanding of this great American artist. And on behalf of many of our colleagues who will be submitting statements for this special order, I want to thank him again.

□ 1910

He was one of those who joined with us in presenting House Concurrent Resolution 57 that designated jazz as a rare and valuable national American treasure, and there were some phrases from that resolution that are particularly appropriate to our remembrance of Miles Davis. As a matter of fact, some of the language almost seemed as if it was written with him in mind: "Whereas, jazz has achieved preeminence throughout the world as an indigenous American music and art form bringing to this country and the world a uniquely American musical synthesis and culture through the African-American experience," and the gentleman from Pennsylvania has referred to how Miles reinterpreted music that was not American and brought it through his horn in a way with Gil Evans, "Sketches of Spain," which now remains an unparalleled classic in American jazz.

Mr. RITTER. I want to commend the gentleman for his comments and just say that this unique idiom of jazz, which is so American and yet comes from roots that are beyond our own borders and shores, really has defined musical culture and not only in this country but throughout the world. It has been a tremendous influence on culture, and to many of us culture really defines the way we live, our politics, our way of going about our lives and our work, and to that we owe such a tremendous debt to those who evolved this jazz idiom and brought it into our lives and into our works.

I yield back to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reminds me of the theory that has been developed by Dr. Billy Taylor, the jazz pianist, who has written a lot about this, that jazz is, in fact, America's classical music. It is the single most adopted music, uniquely American, derived from African-

American roots, but reinterpreted all over the world.

I know that he, like myself, has been in a number of nations and countries to find jazz being played a little bit differently, but that same American force.

Let me just point out another part of this resolution that we passed in 1987 in which it was important to jazz musicians, because it was the first time that the Federal Government, particularly Congress, had ever spoken on this subject, and like the gentleman, I have been in jazz spots. I remember one in particular in New York in which, under a very dim bulb with a thumbtack, was House Concurrent Resolution 57 expressing the sense of Congress respecting the designation of jazz as a rare and national American treasure, and I was flabbergasted by the artists who were pleased and proud. I thought that some might ignore this Federal gesture, but they were very proud that we remembered them, and it has brought a lot of attention to our work.

Of course, most of us who were sponsors of that legislation are now trying to follow up with other ways that we can show those creators of this rare music that we really appreciate them.

There is one more phrase in this resolution that seems appropriate in remembering Miles Davis, because it sounds like we are talking about him. Remember, this is introduced in March 1987: "It is a unifying force bridging cultural, religious, ethnic, and age differences in our diverse society." Who, more than Miles, with all due respect to all the other great jazz artists, because he changed his style so much, he brought in cross-sections of many people. I might suggest that the emphasis of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on his more recent styles contrasts with my initial experience of Miles when he made his very first recording under the age of 21, had gone to New York looking for Charlie Parker, who with Dizzie Gillespie set this new progressive jazz, more popularly referred to as bebop, into an absolute frenzy in which many jazz musicians were resisting this new music, and there Miles Davis cut his first record with Charlie Parker. It was called "Now Is the Time." I believe that was in 1945. And from then on, Miles Davis began to grow.

If you think about it, if you put any musician between Charlie Parker, Dizzie Gillespie on one end, and John Coltrane on the other, and here Miles Davis played with both of them, his greatness as a musical artist was really foretold, and Miles lived long enough to make this enormous contribution.

The last part of this resolution said this, and it might make us remember Miles in this perspective:

That it is a true music of the people, finding its inspiration in the cultures and the most personal experiences of the diverse peoples that constitute our Nation, and it has

evolved into a multifaceted art form which continues to birth and nurture new stylistic idioms and cultural fusions.

And so I submit that somehow when you talk about jazz in its immediate construct, you are thinking about Miles Davis. When you describe the music in this sense, it seemed to me that it was appropriate that we remind the Congress of this enormous loss, this void of a truly great artist.

Mr. RITTER. Miles Davis, as we know, was not just a musician and a great proponent of the idiom, but he was a great leader, too. If you look at his groups, you will not find the collection of talent throughout that nearly five-decade period, you will not find that collection of talent anywhere else. His groups included at any given time during those years the finest musicians playing jazz, and he brought people together, not just black jazz musicians, but white jazz musicians. He sought out excellence. He brought it out in people. That is part of his legacy.

Mr. CONYERS. The gentleman reminds me that Charlie Parker, who was generally considered the creator of progressive jazz known as bebop, heard in this young St. Louis transplant to New York the seeds of the potential, and these great artists have a way of picking other great artists.

He went on to pick up Herbie Hancock, as the gentleman pointed out, and most importantly to me, John Coltrane, who, as a second-generation jazz artist, carried it to an even newer level, and I would like to conclude my contribution to this evening by describing Miles as a misunderstood artist.

□ 1920

People thought that he was being arrogant or haughty when he was really concentrating on his music. People thought that he was ignoring his audience when he removed himself from the stage to let his fellow musicians hold forth without him being there. He was actually a quiet and retrospective man during one period of his life.

I remember it very vividly, because I was talking to his colleagues in New York, in which he had closed himself off from everybody. He was going through a very downy period in his life. He was very depressed and he would not come out of his apartment. People were worried because it went on for a considerable period of time.

I was privy to the discussions of people who were going there trying to get him to come out.

He was a very personal, private man. This, of course, is important that we separate the man from the myth.

In fact, I would like to assert for the record that Miles Davis was actually a musical revolutionary, because the breakthroughs that he made were always accompanied with controversy. Many critics never joined in until pop-

ular acclaim had already writ large the success of his new venture.

Frequently he left different audiences of fans, but he gained new audiences of fans. I think that describes the diversity the gentleman was talking about.

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, I am not sure that he left a certain audience to bring on another audience, but those previous audiences never left him.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, I am glad to know that is the case, because there were a few people who dropped out of some of those audience as he moved from one music to the other, but I am comforted by the fact that there were very few, if any, from the gentleman's perspective.

Mr. RITTER. The quality, the excellence, the brilliance, the magnificence of the music becomes classical. If it is that good, it becomes classical, so those different stages of Miles Davis' musical career, still to this day each one holds something very, very special for an enormous audience.

Now, it may be that one of those audiences does not like the music that another audience likes, but the music is still there for those audiences and will always be in that it is classical, as the gentleman said. This may be our classical music.

Mr. CONYERS. Well, what a wonderful colloquy that we are holding, instead of off the floor, into the RECORD. Since the truth sets you free, I was one of those defectors in Miles' later career that found his earlier music much more moving and touching to me than his later music, but let me quickly describe, if the gentleman has not, in terms of the way that he used his trumpet, not with the usual forte of technique that many trumpeters bring. There were many who could hit higher notes and play with greater speed, but Miles made a premium of making his sounds brief and saying what he wanted to say and leaving spaces that began to say something to us.

He was a man who developed his style, and I might add quickly that he fused style and substance, which is very hard to do, but he was talking with a minimum of notes. He left spaces and silences meant something in his music.

Mr. RITTER. I think that lesson extends beyond the world of music. It certainly extends to us as politicians. We know that to write something meaningful in a 3-minute or a 4-minute speech is far harder than writing something for a 13-minute or a 14-minute speech. Brevity is kind of second to godliness maybe in music as well as in public speaking.

Mr. CONYERS. Let me conclude, because I see the gentlewoman from California [Ms. WATERS] is on the floor and I know the gentlewoman has a lot to say about this subject.



May I continue to describe this sound, because with a Harmon mute Miles Davis began to sound like no other artist that ever used a trumpet. When you think of a mute now in jazz, you think of Miles Davis, and yet there is nobody who reminds you of Miles Davis. Nobody plays like Miles Davis.

What was that sweet sound of the mute? Was it a cry of pain? Was it an expression of joy? What was it?

There was a human tone about it. To me, it signified the ability of this man to rise above the vicissitudes of his life and left us with this superb craftsmanship that makes Miles Davis the appropriate person for special orders in the House of Representatives.

His life, his experiences were somehow crowded into that three-note trumpet, and with that mute it became something very special. It is now a part of this American classical music. It was a revolutionary music, but like all revolutionary things, it did not stay revolutionary, because now it is an accepted form in our culture. As a matter of fact, there are now other forms of music that are considered further out on the edge, but it is strong enough and powerful enough to last I think forever in this great development of jazz contributed by the late, great Miles Davis.

It makes me very proud that I was able to participate in this special order, as well as speak at the memorial service that was held on October 7, at the Nineteenth Street Baptist Church. The memorial service provided various musical selections and testimonials, and was a fine display of honor and respect to Miles Davis. I will incorporate the remarks of our colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include for the RECORD as well, at the end of this special order, the remarks of the Delegate from the District of Columbia [Ms. NORTON].

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Ms. WATERS].

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and pleasure that I join in today's special order to honor our late Miles Davis. I would like to commend both the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for their leadership in calling today's special order.

I would like to say for the record that for years the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] has been a real leader in this Congress, preaching the gospel of jazz, this most American art form. Jazz music has a rich tradition. It is truly our music.

Mr. Speaker, instead of rehashing the wonderful history and contributions of this great artist, Miles Davis, I would like to talk about perhaps another side and describe what happened on this past Saturday at his memorial services at St. Peter's Church in New York.

□ 1930

I had the opportunity to attend a memorial service for Miles in New York at St. Peter's Church, where some 300 friends had been invited to come and celebrate the life and times of Miles Davis.

It was a wonderful and rich gathering. The first speaker on the podium was Q. Quincy Jones. Quincy Jones opened up the memorial service and, of course, reflected on his life and times with Miles Davis.

He was followed by Max Roach, one of the great artists of our times. Max Roach told a wonderful story about Miles Davis' generosity. Max Roach described how he had battled with alcoholism and how he had spent time in rehabilitation, never knowing who was paying for the rehabilitation.

One day he received a note from Miles, and the note simply said:

Max, you got to hurry up and get well; it is costing me much too much money for you to continue to stay there.

It was only with that note that Max understood who had been paying for his rehabilitation for all of these months.

There were many stories that were told last Saturday about Miles Davis. In that room, in addition to Quincy Jones and Max Roach sitting on the front row was Dizzy Gillespie and, mounting the podium was Herbie Hancock.

Herbie Hancock had a wonderful story to tell about the time that he was performing, when he was in the band, and how he hit a wrong chord. He said it was awful, it was absolutely the worst thing that he had ever done in his life. And Miles did not look at him, he did not skip a beat; Miles did something with his horn that made the chord seem as if it was part of the performance and it was meant to be.

And he said it was the most extraordinary exhibition of talent that he had ever seen.

Mr. RITTER. You know, Miles Davis has often been referred to as a genius, as a musical genius. I guess that is true. But somehow when I think of the word "genius," I think of something that is too cold, too mathematical. "Genius" is too narrow. An artist of Miles Davis' stature is beyond genius because it brings in a vast human element that cannot be defined by mind alone, something like that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the gentleman from California.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think the gentleman is absolutely correct. What he has just said I think is exhibited in the fact that this very, very complicated, talented human being was not simply a genius as some would describe it, as the gentleman mentioned, perhaps inadequately so, with his music. Many people do not know that Miles Davis was a tremendously accomplished painter, and his artwork was talked about on Saturday.

There were those who were fortunate enough to have been recipients of his generosity and to hold some of the paintings that he shared with them. He gave his work to friends as gifts, and he spent a tremendous amount of his time, particularly in California, in Malibu, painting. His home there was filled with his work.

As a matter of fact, one of his works was passed out at the memorial services in the way of a poster that was given to all in attendance. So I think the gentleman is perhaps correct, that "genius" is too narrow a definition or description of this multitiered human being, because he was talented in so many ways and in so many areas.

I was pleased also, Mr. Speaker, to hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] talk about the Miles Davis who perhaps some did not know, the Miles Davis who was oftentimes described in the press as rude and insensitive and noncaring about his audience.

Herbie Hancock sat and also talked about the fact that Miles Davis oftentimes turned to communicate to members of the band, and he did that in any number of ways. This fine ear that he had would oftentimes cause him to turn and glance, perhaps, at one of the members of the band in a way of communicating and giving direction about where they were going and what they were trying to achieve.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to hear Herbie Hancock talk about that because I do think that the stories about the infamous, so-called, Miles Davis that were written by many journalists perhaps can be clarified by those who knew him well, those who knew him best and those who were close to him.

Saturday was an interesting and rich experience. In addition to the fine artists and the extraordinary talent that gathered there in this memorial service, there were wonderful pictures of Miles Davis in his unusual and highly styled dress.

These pictures depicted vintage Miles with the clothing that was designed just for him by some of the most talented designers in the world.

Along one wall of that room were young Japanese designers and others who had come to pay their respects to the man they had created for. That, coupled with the depictions of his art and discussions about him from his friends, truly made it a remarkable day.

Mr. RITTER. I think it is really quite wonderful that the gentleman from California shares with this House and with the American people this rather remarkable event and tribute to one of the shining stars of American music in this century. I am delighted that the gentleman from California could join with this special order today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield further to the gentleman.

Ms. WATERS. I thank the gentleman.

Let me just say that Jesse Jackson closed that portion of the remarks with his own description and understanding of Miles. But I think perhaps in a most profound way Jesse Jackson said, in only the manner that Jesse Jackson can say it, "Gabriel, move over, you have got to make room in the section for Miles because Miles has arrived and, Gabriel, you are no longer the single star up there."

I thought that was a rather profound and loving way to conclude what I think was a remarkable service.

Mr. Speaker, again I would like to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS] for allowing me the opportunity to share with the American public some of my thoughts and experiences on this past Saturday with Miles and the Miles memorial.

We will not be able to experience the ever-growing, ever-producing, ever-creating Miles Davis in the same fashion, but we will always experience him because he has left the wealth of his talent behind for us to experience.

This morning as I left my house, I left the CD playing "Tutu," and tonight when I go home I will probably hear "So What," "Some Day My Prince Will Come," and other great musical contributions that Miles left for us, and I hope to be able to experience Miles for as long as I live, and am sure that the American public feels the same way.

Mr. RITTER. I thank the gentleman for her significant contribution to this special order.

Once again her being here on Saturday I think really shares with us and the American people something very, very special.

This morning I came in, and the CD was playing "Round Midnight," and I guess it got me thinking about tonight and doing this special order.

Mr. Speaker, I would close with a recommendation to the American people, to music lovers of all sizes, shapes and types.

□ 1940

Mr. Speaker, as I said in my remarks, take a good close listen to Miles Davis and his music. You will not be disappointed. As a matter of fact, it could become the musical highlight of your life as well.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my colleagues have reserved time to pay respect to Miles Davis, one of the greatest jazz trumpeters. His death marks the loss of a revolutionary musician, composer, and bandleader.

Known as the father of cool jazz, Mr. Davis has recorded some of the world's finest jazz music. His influence on the music industry and jazz styles is unprecedented. His innovative style is expressed through his fusion move-

ment, a combination of jazz and rock, and the incorporation of orchestral pieces into his recordings.

Miles Davis was a true legend. Throughout his career, Mr. Davis played with such musicians as Dizzy Gillespie, Charlie Parker, and John Coltrane, and is credited with the discovery of some of today's celebrated jazz musicians including Tony Williams, Herbie Hancock, and Branford Marsalis.

Mr. Speaker, on September 29, 1991, the Cleveland Plain Dealer ran an article about Davis' life and his numerous contributions to American music. I am pleased to submit this article into the RECORD as a tribute to an extraordinary individual.

#### LEGENDARY JAZZ MUSICIAN MILES DAVIS IS DEAD

SANTA MONICA, CA.—Jazz musician Miles Davis, the legendary trumpeter, band leader and composer whose work inspired a generation of musicians, died yesterday, a hospital spokeswoman said. He was 65.

Davis died of pneumonia, respiratory failure and stroke, said Pat Kirk of St. John's Hospital and Health Center. Kirk said she was reading a statement issued by Davis' doctor, Jeff Harris.

Davis, who had a long history of poor health, was hospitalized earlier this month. He previously had been treated for diabetes and had a hip joint replacement. He also overcame a heroin addiction.

Davis was the most famous trumpeter in his generation, in the line of jazz trumpeters that stretched from Louis Armstrong to Dizzy Gillespie to Wynton Marsalis.

He has been the innovator of more distinct styles than any other jazz musician. He was an astounding spotter and developer of talent, providing the springboard that brought many players to prominence. Tony Williams was just 18 when Davis hired him in 1963; Herbie Hancock was 23 when he joined the same year.

Davis had the respect and admiration of musicians but every time he changed direction, his audience divided between loyal and disenchanted listeners. He ignored them.

In his 1989 autobiography, "Miles," he wrote: "To be and stay a great musician you've got to always be open to what's new, what's happening at the moment."

As well as for his playing, he has been a fascinating, controversial figure because of his enigmatic personality, seemingly remote and arrogant; his thin body and striking face; his angry statements about white people though he often hired white musicians; his whispery, raspy voice—which came after he yelled at somebody following 1956 surgery to remove polyps on his vocal cords.

Miles Dewey Davis III was born in Alton, Ill., May 25, 1926, son of a dentist. When he was 2, the family moved to nearby East St. Louis, Ill., where he grew up.

He got his first trumpet from a family friend as a child and was playing professionally at age 15; his parents wouldn't let him go on the road until he finished high school.

Davis moved to New York in 1944, at 18, to locate Dizzy Gillespie, one of his early trumpet heroes, and jazz saxophonist Charlie Parker. When Gillespie left Parker's combo, Davis replaced him. He also attended the Juilliard School for a year. In 1946 he toured for several months with the young bebop revolutionaries in Billy Eckstine's band.

In 1947, he began a long and successful relationship with Gil Evans, an arranger who knew how to provide a framework for Davis' distinctive sound.

In 1948 he left Parker and, looking for a lighter, subtler, tuneful sound in jazz, he established a nine-piece band, with Evans arrangements, including Gerry Mulligan, Lee Konitz, John Lewis and Max Roach. They recorded "The Birth of the Cool."

That influential album ushered in cool jazz and set the stage for the chamber jazz that followed. It included Davis' best composition by that time, "Boplicity."

Two of his later compositions became jazz standards, "All Blues" and "So What."

He was a parent of cool jazz, but when it became popular, Davis turned his back on it and surrounded himself with bebop players. He became the founder of hard bop.

Davis was married and divorced three times, to dancer Frances Taylor, singer Betty Mabry and actress Cicely Tyson. He has a daughter, Cheryl, and three sons, Gregory, Miles IV and Erin.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, it is with both sadness and delight that I join my colleagues on the floor today for this special order called to recognize the pioneering contributions of Miles Davis as a musician and composer. While it is his passing that brings us together, his rich musical legacy gives us much to celebrate and remember.

Miles Davis was well known to the citizens of the District of Columbia, having performed here many times during his 45-year career. One of his early and memorable performances occurred during 1958 when he and his quintet appeared during a week-long jazz show at the Howard Theater. At that time, Miles' group included such legends such as John Coltrane and Cannonball Adderly. In between shows, he could regularly be found across the street dining at Cecelia's Restaurant, an establishment well known for the hospitality it extended to artists performing at the Howard.

From the late 1950's through 1968, Miles would also frequently play at the Bohemian Caverns on U Street, where he was a good friend to the club's owner, Tony Taylor. The Caverns seated about 150 people, but when Miles played the room was always full with patrons lining the stairs leading up to the street.

During the mid-sixties, Miles telephoned the District's renowned pianist and vocalist Shirley Horn, and expressed an interest in her music. She thought it was joke and hung up on him. Later, she had the opportunity to visit Davis at his home in New York, and was surprised to be greeted by his children singing some of her music. Following that encounter, Davis made possible Shirley Horn's debut with her trio at the legendary Village Vanguard, the flagship of New York jazz clubs. Horn opened for Davis' own show. Their musical relationship continued over the years and Shirley Horn's latest album, "You Won't Forget Me," features Miles playing a lovely ballad with her.

As a member of the musical distance Miles Davis traveled in his career, he found common ground 20 years later with yet another of the District's musicians, drummer Ricky "Sugarfoot" Wellman. Wellman's drumming was one of the definitive components of a locally developed music called go-go. Davis heard a recording on which Wellman played and was so struck by the power of Wellman's sound that he recruited him for his own band where he became an integral member.

In 1985, Miles Davis celebrated his 40th year as a performing artist here in the District,



when he performed at the D.C. Convention Center as the featured artist at the first Capital City Jazz Festival. On display during the festival was a collection of oil paintings done by Miles, an example of his neverending search for new vehicles for creative expression.

This past Monday, October 7, nearly 300 people gathered in the District at the 19th Street Baptist Church to say goodbye to Miles Davis. This memorial service was convened by Dr. Bill Hassan and the members of the Friday Listening Group. Among those present delivering remarks were Rev. Jerry Moore, Jim Vance, Stanley Turrentine, and my colleague JOHN CONYERS. Each of them made clear that Miles Davis was a unique voice in the field of jazz and American music whose achievements have made him a major figure in world culture.

Mr. OWENS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleague, Congressman CONYERS, and others, in this colloquy honoring the memory of one of the giants of jazz, trumpeter Miles Davis, who died September 28 after a long illness. Miles Davis was particularly well known in my home State of New York, where he studied music at Juilliard in New York City, and where he made his reputation as an innovative trumpeter performing in the city's 52d Street jazz clubs during the late 1940's and early 1950's.

I admired Miles Davis for never being content to remain stuck in one particular musical style; he was always changing with the times, always incorporating the latest forms of African-American music in his work, whether it was R&B, blues, rock, avant garde, or jazz fusion. I will especially remember him for having participated in an album called "Sun City" in the mid-1980's, in which jazz artists, rappers, reggae, rock, and soul musicians protested the horrors of apartheid in South Africa. All of the artists, including Mr. Davis, donated their work on the album, and proceeds from the album sales funded a program for the wives and children of South African political prisoners. Miles Davis was thus a fine example of an artist who employs his or her work in the interest of social change. He was also an important mentor to generations of young African-American jazz musicians, many of whom he recruited to play in his various bands, such as pianist Herbie Hancock and drummer Tony Williams, people who went on to have illustrious jazz careers of their own. I am sure that Miles Davis' artistry, creativity, and generosity of spirit will be greatly missed.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleagues from Pennsylvania, Mr. RITTER, and from Michigan, Mr. CONYERS, for organizing this special order to honor the memory and music of one of America's most gifted artists, Miles Davis.

As the Member who represents Sedalia, MO, the home of Scott Joplin, who was perhaps the foremost interpreter of ragtime, the forerunner of modern jazz, I have a soft spot in my heart for this uniquely American art form. Miles Davis carries on in this rich tradition of American expression in music.

When Miles Davis passed away on September 28, the world lost one of its most creative jazz innovators. Luckily for us and for generations to come, the music Miles Davis shared with us will always be around to enjoy.

As a trumpeter and composer, Davis was legendary for his skill and versatility. Davis

amazed fans and fellow musicians alike, fearlessly changing his musical styles throughout the years. He was quoted as saying, "Music isn't about standing still and becoming safe." From his impressive catalog of recorded works, it is easy to see that Davis lived this belief.

Miles Davis enriched our country's musical heritage. It is important to acknowledge his influence on other musicians, especially younger musicians. Davis' evolving styles meant that he frequently worked with younger musicians, encouraging them to discover their own musical voices. The musicians he fostered often moved on to make innovations of their own.

Miles Davis will be missed, but his contributions to the world of music will never be forgotten.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LEWIS of Georgia). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

#### MENTAL ILLNESS AWARENESS WEEK

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to submit statements for the RECORD on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I am going to yield in just a moment to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI] with whom I have been able, happily, to work with as we and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] have formed a mental health working group here in the Congress to highlight the problems of mental illness and to look at what can be done in the legislative framework to address this.

Mr. Speaker, this is Mental Illness Awareness Week, and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY], and I requested this special order so that we could bring home some of the problems of mental illness and also dedicate ourselves to seeing that the Congress address them.

At this time I yield to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI].

Mr. KOPETSKI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr.

WISE] and really commend him on the leadership that he has displayed in this legislative term in addressing this very serious issue that affects millions of Americans, and I would commend him as well for working with the mental health awareness group.

Mr. Speaker, this morning was a fine example where we had the great opportunity to have somebody speak to Members of Congress and their staff: Mr. Earl Campbell. Many Americans know Mr. Campbell because of his exploits on the football field. But Mr. Campbell has a disease, and he has the courage to step forward and talk about that disease. It is a mental illness. It is called panic disorder, and, Mr. Speaker, it was very enlightening to have him, as the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] knows, come forward because it takes a lot of courage to talk about mental illnesses to the public.

So, Mr. Speaker, I really thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] for joining with me and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTLEY] in trying to bring the Congress together, and make them aware of these issues and make them aware of how in different ways we can affect public policy in this area.

There is a disease, Mr. Speaker, which lives in this country. It is a disease that is taking lives. Those with this disease are almost always treated as outcasts, as if they resigned their membership in the human race.

They are frequently avoided and shunned.

Mr. Speaker, this disease affects millions of Americans. Each year it wreaks havoc on over 30 million adults in this country. One in every five citizens is affected by this disease at some point in their lives. This disease has a higher morbidity rate than many other chronic medical conditions, including heart disease, lung disease, and hypertension.

Mr. Speaker, this disease tears at the very fabric of our society. It takes its toll in dollars as well as lives. The direct and related costs of this disease add up to roughly \$129 billion each year. It destroys productivity. Those afflicted with this disease frequently become wards of the State, instead of being able to contribute to society.

This disease is greatly burdening our Nation's social support structure as well. There are an estimated 100,000 people in jail with this disease. To paraphrase a leading psychiatrist, if there were 100,000 people in jails with heart disease, or Parkinson's disease, or multiple sclerosis, there would be a public outcry. Unfortunately, this disease is so misunderstood that there is none today. In many jails today, those with this disease are put in a cell and held for days and even weeks before any medication is prescribed or treatment begun.

Our Nation's homeless problem is still with us on the highways, and the streets and the alleys of America. Hundreds of thousands of Americans sleep on the streets, under bridges, and in doorways each night. And roughly one-third of these people suffer from this disease.

Mr. Speaker, these people can be helped. However, these illnesses frequently go untreated. Only 1 in 5 of those with this disease have had treatment in the past 6 months. This state of affairs is exacerbated by the fact that these diseases frequently strike the young. Young people, under age 20, are in the peak age range for developing many types of these diseases.

Mr. Speaker, this disease is mental illness. This week is Mental Illness Awareness Week. As such, I am rising today to draw attention to the fact that these diseases are misunderstood, too often ignored, affect a large number of Americans, and are taking a heavy toll in human life and national productivity. This does not have to be the case. I congratulate and thank my colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN], who is the chief sponsor of the resolution and has been in this body, to designate a week, this particular week, as Mental Illness Awareness Week. I look forward to working with him and the rest of my colleagues, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], who have put together a working group so that, when we talk about universal health care coverage for all Americans, we can also include in that the importance of mental illness.

Oftentimes we talk about prevention, prevention in our society, and the great amount of money it takes. If we spent a little money up front, we would save millions and billions of dollars down the road. Clearly this is one area that is ripe for these prevention dollars.

As we look at the complexity of society today and the stresses and the strains, as our hero for the day, Earl Campbell, spoke so courageously about this morning, we have to understand that it should not be embarrassing to talk publicly about mental illnesses, that one should not be embarrassed about going to a psychiatrist, or a psychologist, a social worker, and saying, "I have this problem." All of these disorders can be treated. Perhaps it is a biological problem, perhaps it is a medical problem, and perhaps it is just the stress and strain of a complex American life. We need it, whether it is the music of Miles Davis that can bring help and understanding to us, or the educated care that a psychiatrist can give us. This is what adequately competent people can bring to us, and help us through our daily lives, and help us also have the rich rewarding life that we know we can have in places in America and places in my home State, Oregon.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE] for yielding to me.

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI], and I just want to thank the gentleman for what he has done. He took the lead in organizing the mental health working group, he has taken the lead in getting renowned experts to testify in front of us and to appear in front of us. He has taken the lead in bringing Members of Congress together I think in record numbers for congressional breakfasts. There are a number of those around, infinite number it seems like on any given day, but the organization that he has helped bring together and has brought together is attracting a large, broad spectrum of members, and it is a testimony, and I just want to thank him for all he has done to make it possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak for just a second also on the direct cost to society with mental illness because there is a mental illness cost, and our failure as a society to grapple with it I think shows that.

□ 1950

When you realize, for instance, that major depression and manic depressive disorders affect 1 out of every 10 Americans, that is right, 10 percent of Americans are affected by major depression or manic depressive disorders. A recent study examined six major medical conditions, including hypertension, diabetes, lung diseases, arthritis, and found the only severe heart disease to be associated with more disability and interruption of daily functioning than this profoundly debilitating form of mental illness.

There are anywhere from it is estimated 700,000, 1 million, 2 million homeless persons in the Nation. Nearly a third of those have some form of mental illness.

Thirty-five to forty percent of the homeless population also have alcohol or other drug problems.

Mr. Speaker, among our children suicide is the third leading cause of death for individuals between the ages of 15 and 24. Among adolescents, suicide has increased by over 30 percent since 1950. Our children are reaching out and crying out, and somehow we are not getting there. We are not responding.

A National Institute for Mental Health study found that 12½ percent of adults have a diagnosable and potentially treatable mental disorder, with more than 10 percent of the population being affected.

Walk down a street any day and you pass nine people. Of the group of 10, somebody has a form of mental illness or is going to.

There is a need for mental health policy, a mental health policy and mental health strategy in our Nation. It is certainly true with respect to coverage for

the treatment of mental and addictive disorders, where there is clear and substantial costs, that include lost work, reduced productivity, prisoner recidivism, and a growing burden on the Federal, State, and local judicial and social welfare systems from untreated mental illness and substance abuse.

A 1985 study by the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration, concluded that the indirect costs of mental illness in terms of lost productivity, lost employment, and so on, are three times the actual cost of treatment. So by not treating mental illness, it costs our society three times as much as if it did treat mental illness.

In addition, the related costs, from auto accidents, crime, social welfare, all of these, total nearly 73 percent of the actual treatment costs. Of course, these indirect costs are borne by taxpayers.

There are important new things that can be done and are being done to manage and treat people with these disorders, so mental illness has got to be included as part of any national health strategy that comes out of this Congress.

Businesses, consumers, and Federal and State governments are already paying for health care for the uninsured, but doing so in an inefficient and inequitable manner.

The failure to account for mental illness only compounds the problem.

There is also the problem of prejudice, misunderstanding and myth about mental illness. It has been a major impediment to its inclusion in health care, whether at the Government level or at the private level.

It is necessary to include mental illness with the other issues of health in this Nation and to bring all the resources of this Nation together to conquer mental illness within the foreseeable future.

The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTELEY] this morning at this breakfast with Earl Campbell and Dr. Freida Lewis Hawes I think put it well. I am going to paraphrase what he said, because it moved me at the time.

He said if somebody finds out they have cancer, they walk into their neighbor's house and their neighbor says, "How are you doing?" So you would tell them. "I have cancer, and I am having to have chemotherapy or radiation treatment."

You would be sorry for them, but you would understand, and there is no stigma attached to that, even though that is a debilitating illness. People understand that. It is a physical illness. It is compartmentalized as such, and no one would have a reluctance to confide that in a friend.

But if you have a mental illness, how many people feel so inclined or so comfortable or so able to talk to a neighbor, and the neighbor says, "What is



wrong? I notice something wrong." How many would say, "I have an emotional disturbance," or, "I have a mental illness. I have a schizophrenic process problem. I have manic depressive disorder. I am afflicted in this way."

The answer is, not many. Because there is a stigma attached to mental illness. It is unfair. Particularly since medical science has proven much in just the past few years, these last 10 years, for instance, that shows that mental illness is not a crime. It is not a fault. It is not some kind of inherent sense of original sin arising from some wrongdoing. Mental illness is an illness, and it needs to be considered as such.

I think of how far we have come in just a few years. When I was in my late teens and early twenties I worked 3 years in a mental health facility, in every type of milieu, whether it be a locked ward, whether it be an open ward, whether it be a residential facility. I look and see how far we have come.

Yet, as far as we have come 20 years since I was working in those facilities, in some ways we are still at the very most basic stages.

I look back on some of our treatment techniques 20 years ago in one of the best medical model facilities in the country, and I think how far we have moved, and I have got a feeling that in 10 years I will be looking back at today and seeing how primitive this was, and hopefully the evolution goes on.

I think for instance of a young man I knew, I will just name as Bill, who was then maybe 23 years old, and the horrors that he went through as he underwent a schizophrenic process on a regular basis, and how we were unable really to grapple with that process that he went through.

He was fortunate because he had insurance coverage and parents, I believe, of probably above-average income means. I just wonder how many patients that did not have insurance coverage and that did not have that situation simply wandered the streets or ended up in the jails. Today there are medications that will help him and help those with that affliction.

I look at the gains, for instance, in the area of manic-depressive disorders. When I was involved, lithium was just being tested for the first time. Today lithium carbonate is the major treatment for many with manic-depressive disorders.

Anorexia nervosa, panic disorder, anxiety attacks, so many of the different types of illnesses that were not understood then, now are being treated.

Part of that, I think, and it is important to understand just as we acknowledge Mental Illness Awareness Week, it is also important to recognize that this has been designated the Decade of the Brain. The dollars that this Congress

and this country put into that research, the Decade of the Brain, will reap us benefits one hundredfold.

In the area of mental illness and mental health, more importantly, they are helpless to realize what the brain is, to understand it, to comprehend it, to be able to do the cross-sections that are so important, to be able to do the scans, and to understand the physical makeup of the brain, the chemical makeup. What once was thought of as some sort of fault in somebody's moral character, we now recognize as having a physiological underpinning and can be treated in that way.

So I hope that this Congress will fund adequately and this President will recommend adequate funding, so that the Decade of the Brain can truly realize its potential. Remembering that for the National Institute of Mental Health, for instance, only a very small fraction of the grants that are approved are actually funded.

Let me just stress that. These are not the people that make application. Of the grants that are approved, just a very small fraction are actually able to be funded. Those grants that are noteworthy, those grants that are meritorious, that are worthy of being funded, most of them simply are not. So we are not able to do the research that is necessary.

But remember that the Decade of the Brain holds promise not just for treating mental illness, but also helping us understand how we learn, how we grow, how we develop. So the funding for it is just essential so that our researchers can help us finish the Decade of the Brain with a true, true growth in human understanding.

There are other areas that this Congress can be active in, and that is in recognizing that our health strategy that is devised in this Congress and by this President must have a strong mental health component; that our Medicare and Medicaid Programs of today, our existing programs, are not adequate and do not cover adequately mental illness; and that new programs that are designed, and I think this Congress is going to be acting, and I hope that this Congress is going to be acting within this next year on major medical legislation, health delivery legislation that guarantees affordable access to health care for everyone, and that is a subject for another special order, but it has to recognize the need for the mental health part to that.

So there is much that this Congress can do and much that this Congress can focus on.

Mr. Speaker, mental illness is something that we have to bring out, we have to talk about, we have to understand, and we have to appreciate. We have to put it in its proper perspective, which is not some great bogeyman, it is not some kind of unknown devil.

□ 2000

It is there, and it is something that the seeds in all of us, just as the seeds of heart trouble, cancer, we can name it, are also there.

Earl Campbell, a well-known football player, 1977 Heisman Trophy winner, ran for 9,407 yards in his professional career with the Houston Oilers and the New Orleans Saints. He made the commitment to come forward.

If Earl Campbell can come forward and say, "I have a panic disorder and I didn't understand what it was for a long time. I went to physicians and they told me that I was just nervous. They sent me on vacations and they told me to relax."

"It wasn't until I went to a psychiatrist," and then, as he related it to us, he got in the psychiatrist's office and realized what nature of medicine the doctor was and became very abusive saying, "I don't need to be in a shrink's office."

But he said that is what he needed. So if Earl Campbell can come forward, my hope is that of the millions of Americans that are in their homes, the millions of Americans that are wondering what it is they have got going on within them, that they, too, will seek that help and, most importantly, that as they seek that help, that help will be available to them.

If that awareness gets out, then Mental Illness Awareness Week has been a success and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN] and all those who made it possible and worked to pass this legislation will have succeeded because awareness is crucial. Awareness and then commitment to bringing mental illness into its proper perspective and to bring mental health to all Americans.

Mr. McDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues, the gentlemen from Oregon [Mr. KOPETSKI], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. MACHTELY], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WISE], for convening this special order in observance of Mental Illness Awareness Week.

Mental illness affects 30 million Americans, yet profound misunderstanding and misinformation continue to surround these illnesses. The fact is, one in five Americans will have a diagnosable mental disorder requiring treatment at some point in their lives. And the fact is, most disorders are eminently treatable.

Attitudes are changing. A poll by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation reported that 74 percent of those surveyed believe that anyone can become mentally ill. The majority believe that the staying in the community will help a patient recover, and 43 percent believe that having a mental illness is so different from having any other kind of illness. Still, fewer than one in three said they would welcome a mental health facility in their area. Clearly, we have more educating to do on this issue.

We have made enormous progress in some areas of mental illness—particularly in treatment of chronic disease such as manic-depression illness and schizophrenia.

Many of these illnesses can be controlled with proper medication and other treatment—in the same way that diabetes or hypertension is controlled—and these people lead productive, fully functional lives. They deserve to lead those lives without stigma or penalty, and I am pleased that the Americans With Disabilities Act we passed last year will at last offer protection from discrimination in the workplace. But we have only begun to understand the chemistry of the brain, and we need much more research in this area.

Sadly, in other areas of mental health, we have lost much ground. When I graduated from medical school in the mid-1960's, our Nation had embarked on an ambitious effort to reform our mental health system by shifting our emphasis from long-term hospitalization of patients to community-based care.

At that time, deinstitutionalization seemed attractive from almost every point of view. It promised independent living and better care for patients, and less cost for Government. But our reach exceeded our grasp. The community mental health centers designed to provide outpatient care never were fully funded.

Advances in pharmacology were no substitute for personal supervision and support. In the 1980's, a critical housing shortage, coupled with deinstitutionalization, forced more and more people onto the streets.

Of course, wholesale warehousing of patients in mental hospitals had been wrong—bad medicine and bad public policy. But it also was wrong to send these people out into the world with nothing more than a promise, a pill, and a prayer.

We have replaced deinstitutionalization with transinstitutionalization: we are still warehousing our mentally ill—but now they are in welfare hotels, in homeless shelters, in nursing homes, in our prisons, and on the streets, receiving very little treatment, and less hope.

The benign neglect of the 1970's gave way in the 1980's to an even greater failure in government's responsibility to care for those in need. Not only were national leadership and vision lacking, but the Federal Government simply turned its back on prevention, early intervention, and treatment programs.

The Reagan administration's merciless veto pen slashed essential support programs as well, like nutrition, health care, education, housing, and social services. Many State and local governments have tried to fill the gap, but few have been able to do so. Research programs have also languished, and important areas like geriatric psychiatry have been seriously neglected.

We pay a price for this neglect, and nowhere is it more evident than in the faces and hearts of our children; 7½ to 9½ million children in this country have severe emotional disturbances. Twelve percent of all children suffer mental disorders.

Nearly 2½ million children were reported abused or neglected in 1989 and these numbers are on the rise. Children are being raised in poverty, in one-parent families, on the streets, in shelters. Who is taking care of these children? Our mental health and social service systems are overwhelmed, and people on the front lines in these fields have been begging for help for a decade. But we continue to ignore the problem. Where is the

President when it comes to suffering in his own back yard? Our children are in crisis—they need help now, but I am sorry to say that it appears that it will get worse before it gets better.

The tragedy is that, while children are our most vulnerable population, they are also the most resilient. Children who are at risk for mental and emotional disorders can be identified and treated. We know how to intervene and we know it can save these kids' lives. Abused children, for example, do not have to grow up to become offenders of the abuse that victimized them. We know how to stop that cycle. We know it saves our society enormous costs down the road and, more important, prevents much suffering. Yet we refuse to invest the resources to intervene. Instead, we allow the tragedies to multiply.

By adolescence we see vividly the results of the pain and suffering we have ignored. We see children having children—without adequate resources or skills. We see children killing themselves. Suicide has increased among adolescents by over 30 percent since 1950. It is the second leading cause of death among young adults aged 15 to 24. We see children killing others. For young black men, the picture is especially grim—the leading cause of death for black males age 15 to 24 is homicide. How can it be that in the richest country in the world we are raising more and more children who are so desperate that they resort to killing themselves and others?

There are many kinds of intervention that work to help families in crisis. In my district of Seattle, for example, there is a unique program called Childhaven, which treats abused and neglected children by providing full-day therapeutic care. Not only do the children get the help they need, but the parents get the time to get help themselves. We need more programs like Childhaven in this country. Children's Hospital in Seattle has forged an alliance between mental health providers, school districts, and child welfare agencies to provide comprehensive help to families and children at risk. We need more such collaborative efforts that coordinate services so that children do not fall through the cracks.

My colleague from California, Mr. MILLER, has developed legislation for childhood mental health services that would go a long way toward reforming our present system.

The growing numbers of children facing life on the margins in an indifferent society are forming a wave that is crashing down on all of us. Our neglect of our children in past years has already produced a generation of anguished, alienated, and angry young adults. If we do not stop the persistent cycles of abandonment and abuse that have plagued these children, we will find our mental health system, our social service system, our prison system, and our economic system overwhelmed with the consequences of our failure.

Mental illness and substance abuse cost our country more than \$270 billion each year. We could reduce this cost substantially if we made the investments in preventive care and treatment to address the mental and emotional needs of our citizens. Families are struggling with these problems every day, and they desperately need our help.

I commend my colleagues for drawing attention to this important issue and for their efforts on behalf of the mental health of our citizens.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Joint Resolution 156, Mental Illness Awareness Week, and take this opportunity to express my sincere hope the Congress will fulfill the expectations of the decade of the brain resolution and proclamation in the fiscal year 1992 appropriations bill—H.R. 2707. As we move into the Decade of the Brain with momentum, it is now up to Congress to keep mental illness research and services a top priority.

There is still a long way to go. As Dr. D. Allan Bromley, the President's coordinator for the Decade of the Brain, has noted:

[We] know vastly more about the first microsecond of the existence of our universe, or about the constituents of any atom, or about the interior of the sun, than we do about the three pounds of tissue inside our own heads. Brain research is truly one of the great frontier areas of science \*\*\* it is a frontier that promises enormous practical payoff in the form of new treatments and possibly new ways of prevention.

Even in these enlightened times, and notwithstanding the enactment of the Decade of the Brain, it is clear that mental illness, a problem of major proportions which adversely affects our health, well being, and productivity as a nation, is still shrouded in mystery, shame, and stigma.

The prevalence and destructive consequence of mental illness in the United States is well documented. Each year mental disorders wreak havoc on over 30 million adults in this country. In fact, one in every five citizens at some point in life will experience such debilitating conditions as schizophrenia, depression, Alzheimer's disease, manic depressive illness, or anxiety disorders.

Tragically, only one-fifth of all adults with a diagnosable mental illness in this country actually receive the treatment they need. In addition to this—and perhaps even more alarming—is the fact that some 8.1 million youngsters suffer from mental illness and often go untreated for years, even though effective help is available. But even these chilling statistics cannot measure the cost of the untold human suffering experienced by our citizens every day. Indeed, this suffering often leads vulnerable individuals to turn to suicide as a way out of continuing their frequently unnecessarily painful lives. Depression is the major risk factor for suicide in this country.

The severe disability directly caused by mental disorders is also clear even if one considers only the amount of time Americans spend in treatment for them. For example, only heart disease is associated with more bed days per month than depression. Depression, in fact, has been shown to have a higher morbidity rate than many other chronic medical conditions, including heart disease, lung disease and, hypertension. The direct and related costs of mental disorders add up to a staggering \$129 billion each year.

Unparalleled research opportunities exist. NIMH has launched a concerted and powerful effort not only to overcome mental disorders but also to eliminate associated intransigent and discriminatory stigma which have further victimized mental patients and their families.



NIMH must continue to provide leadership at the national level on the major issues involving mental illness and mental health.

As a part of its leadership role, NIMH has completed a series of four strategic plans, three of which are already being implemented. Each is designed with a separate, distinct strategy in mind, and all are aimed at attacking, through research, the biggest mental health problems of our day. These are approaching the 21st century: opportunities for NIMH neuroscience research; the national plan for research on schizophrenia and the brain; the national plan for research on child and adolescent mental disorders; and a new and highly promising plan, caring for people with mental illness: a national plan of research to improve services. This new research plan represents a systematic, science-based attack on the inadequacy and low quality of services provided to severely mentally ill persons in this country. Taken together, these four research plans provide an overarching strategy to guide NIMH research programs throughout this decade.

Unfortunately, unfair and unreasonable attitudes associated with illnesses of the mind and brain were carried over into our public policies for many years. As a result, the mental health field was chronically and severely underfunded and has been struggling to catch up.

For too many years, basic biomedical research on mental illness was a stepsister to research into other physiological diseases. But over the past several years, we have made substantial progress in directing attention and resources to mental illness research. The Decade of the Brain resolution and proclamation have generated a great deal of interest in mental illness research, and we have made substantial increases in the appropriations for this research.

I am hopeful that as my colleagues and I meet in conference later this month to develop the final version of the Labor/Health and Human Services/Education appropriations measure for 1992, we will again be able to demonstrate our support for mental illness research.

In addition to research into the causes and treatment of mental illness, the National Institute of Mental Health funds vitally important research into how to organize effective outreach to and services for the mentally ill. For example, through funding projects to aid the transition from homelessness [PATH] grants, a program initiated by Senator DOMENICI and approved by Congress last year, we can initiate and enhance services to one of the most difficult groups of mentally ill individuals to reach and treat—persons who are mentally ill and homeless.

Mr. Speaker, it is conservatively estimated that 35 percent of all homeless individuals are seriously ill. Many of these individuals also suffer from substance abuse disorders. The intent of PATH is to link housing and services for persons who are homeless and mentally ill, including those who suffer from substance abuse disorders. Eighty percent of the moneys dispersed to community providers by States must be used for such purposes as community mental health services, case management services, substance and alcohol abuse treat-

ment, and referrals to primary health services. Twenty percent of the moneys may be used for housing purposes such as minor renovations, security deposits, one-time rental payments, and coordinating between housing and service providers. States are required to contribute \$1 for every \$3 of Federal funds received under PATH.

Mr. Speaker, when the President introduced his homeownership and opportunity for people everywhere [HOPE] initiative, he included Shelter Plus Care, a program similar to Senator DOMENICI'S PATH initiative. The most recent issue of the Decade of the Brain, the research quarterly for the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill, includes a lead story by our former colleague and now Secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development, Jack Kemp, featuring the promise of the PATH/Shelter Plus Care Program. I include the article at this point, and I again ask my colleagues to join me in supporting the research, treatment, and services funding needed to bring hope to persons with mental illness, their families, and their communities.

#### HOPE FOR THE MENTALLY ILL HOMELESS (By the Honorable Jack Kemp)

We Americans take pride in our freedom and independence, our well-deserved reputation as the land of opportunity. But even as we cherish our leadership role in the free world, we are disheartened at the sight of those whom President Bush has called "people who stand in the shadows . . . who live in a nightmare in the midst of the American dream. We see them every day on the streets of our cities, sleeping on the steam grates, living out of cardboard boxes."

The tragedy of homelessness strikes at the spiritual core of the American people. The plight of the homeless is unacceptable; in a land as rich and bountiful as ours, it is both unacceptable and intolerable, and President Bush has made a commitment to help end this tragedy of homelessness and help recapture the American Dream.

Perhaps the most helpless—the hardest-to-reach and most difficult to serve souls of this troubled population—are the mentally ill homeless. Heartbreaking visions of disoriented men and women pushing shopping carts, aimlessly wandering the streets, challenge us to find solutions. As President Bush has said, ". . . the real answer for the homeless, those with mental problems or dependent on drugs or alcohol, is shelter plus care shelter supplemented by the necessary support services to get these people the help they need to live in dignity."

When the President introduced his HOPE initiative—Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere—he included Shelter Plus Care as one of its key elements. Based on an idea originated by Senator Pete Domenici of New Mexico, the Shelter Plus Care program combines housing assistance with supportive services of homeless persons who are seriously mentally ill and substance abusers—about 50 percent of the homeless population. The program assists States and cities actively engaged in outreach to the homeless street population, matching housing assistance with supportive services that include: health care, mental health treatment, detoxification, case management, education, job training, and other services essential to independent living.

Linking housing with services enables local providers to address the needs of the homeless in a coordinated and comprehensive way. Shelter Plus Care offers housing

options ranging from transitional to permanent, emphasizing the creation of permanent housing arrangements.

The needs of homeless persons, especially the mentally ill homeless, are complex and ill-served by unilateral efforts. Given the wide range of needs and services required by the homeless and the wide range of services available through Federal, State and local entities and private non-profit groups, it is clear that coordination and mutually supportive efforts will deliver more effective solutions to the problems of homeless persons. This understanding guided our approach to Shelter Plus Care, and it drives our other efforts on behalf of mentally ill homeless persons, such as the close working relationship we have established with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS).

HHS Secretary Dr. Louis Sullivan and I have entered our Departments into a memorandum of understanding designed to better integrate housing and services for the poor, with particular emphasis on the mentally ill homeless. We have begun a number of initiatives under this agreement, including demonstrations we are jointly funding with the National Institute of Mental Health. These demonstrations focus on activities designed to promote coordinated housing and mental health services for severely ill homeless persons.

In California, for instance, San Diego State University will work with San Diego County Mental Health Services and the San Diego City Housing Commission in evaluating the effectiveness of providing comprehensive supportive services coordinated with independent housing alternatives for severely mentally ill homeless adults. The demonstration will emphasize individual choice in the selection of the housing options as well as support services. This research is based on the hypothesis that persons in the experimental program will show a decreased level of psychopathology, increased housing stability, and an improved quality of life when compared to a control group receiving traditional case management.

Another demonstration under the HUD/NIMH joint initiative will produce a manual on the coordinated provision of housing and services for homeless mentally ill persons. Generally, neither housing agencies nor mental health services providers are familiar with how to access the assistance each offers. The manual will describe the range of programs available, and how to access and coordinate them to promote independent living for the mentally ill homeless.

HUD also is collaborating with the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation in a demonstration program on chronic mental illness. Nine of the nation's sixty largest cities are receiving funding and housing assistance over a five year period to centralize administrative, fiscal, and clinical responsibility in a single mental health authority. These authorities are organizing and financing a comprehensive system of services, including expanded housing opportunities made possible by Section 8 rent subsidies provided by HUD to enable their development of safe, affordable housing in their communities.

We have a similar partnership under way with the Foundation on behalf of dysfunctional homeless families; collaboration with the Department of Veterans Affairs that links housing assistance with support services for mentally ill homeless veterans; and a joint demonstration with the Department of Labor to increase employment and obtain housing for homeless persons.

We have achieved a new level of cooperation at the Federal level, and we need simi-

lar efforts at the State and local level where the vital programs and services are delivered.

What is evident from our experience thus far is that integration of services with housing assistance—a comprehensive, coordinated approach—is the most effective and efficient way to meet the needs of mentally ill homeless persons . . . indeed of all segments of the homeless population.

As part of our continuing commitment, President Bush has assigned HUD the lead among seventeen federal agencies to develop a Comprehensive Federal Plan to End Homelessness. This plan focuses on better integration of services, improved access to permanent housing, and prevention of homelessness. When implemented, the plan will link housing and services, improve coordination among all Federal, state, and local programs, and better target available resources.

The research and results arrived at through our various partnerships, through the federal plan, and through the substantial efforts of the Interagency Council on the Homeless, will provide the insights we feel are essential to helping homeless persons return to mainstream society and offer those incapable of independent living the support necessary to live in dignity.

Mr. MACHTELEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from West Virginia for yielding.

It is my pleasure to salute Mental Illness Awareness Week.

And I particularly commend my other colleague from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, for introducing the resolution to draw attention to mental illness.

It was not long ago that you would not be able to gather a group of Members to discuss mental illness.

Mental illness was, and sadly still is, thought upon by many as a social problem, not a medical one; 71 percent of people surveyed by the National Alliance for the Mentally Ill say they believe mental disorders are an emotional weakness, and only 10 percent believe there may be a medical, biological basis for mental illnesses. These figures show we need to make more strides forward to help people understand the nature of mental illnesses. This is why we are here today.

Over 90 percent of what we know about the brain today has been learned in the last 10 years.

How have we learned so much about mental illness and the working of the brain? Simply, research. Research has dramatically changed our understanding and response to mental illness. And, mental health research has become a much more exacting science over the past decade.

By studying the chemical balance and structure of the brain, scientists have found the biological roots to many serious mental conditions. For instance, take manic depressive disorder—one of the most debilitating of mental illnesses. This illness—characterized by extreme mood swings—affects 1 in 100 Americans. Without treatment, this disorder can severely disrupt the life of those affected, and the lives of family and loved ones.

However, study of manic depression has led to a better understanding of the biochemical reactions which contribute to this disorder. Research has taught doctors that with the right combination of psychotherapy and medication, 70 percent of people who suffer from manic

depressive illness can live happy, functioning lives. By helping these people live functional lives, we save nearly \$8 billion annually in treatment costs and lost productivity. We also break the pattern of this destructive mental illness.

Research into the causes of mental illness and how to improve treatment is challenging. But as the scientific understanding of mental illnesses continues to expand, we have the potential to make a real difference in the lives of many people with severe mental illnesses. Research gives us the promise that we can better treat, better prevent, and possibly stop the suffering of mental illness.

The 1990's is the Decade of the Brain. The past 10 years has marked leaps forward in understanding the brain. This decade, the Decade of the Brain, can lead us to know the causes of mental illness and thereby stop the destruction. Mental health should be included in general health care.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. WASHINGTON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 10, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

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

Mr. CHANDLER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. KOPETSKI, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. SLATTERY, for 60 minutes, on October 15.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. BALLENGER.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. SHUSTER.

Mrs. ROUKEMA.

Mr. PORTER.

Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

Mr. GEKAS in two instances.

Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. GREEN.

Mr. BLAZ.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

Mr. PACKARD.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR.

Mr. SABO.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. BILBRAY.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. CONYERS.

Mr. ROWLAND.

Mr. ACKERMAN.

Mr. MILLER of California.

Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland.

Mr. WEISS.

Mr. ERDREICH.

Mr. RUSSO.

Mr. MURPHY.

Mrs. BYRON.

Mr. RANGEL in two instances.

Mr. DARDEN.

Mr. TOWNS in two instances.

Mr. DOWNEY.

Ms. NORTON.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

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

S.J. Res. 107. Joint resolution to designate October 15, 1991, as "National Law Enforcement Memorial Declaration Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S.J. Res. 160. Joint resolution designating the week beginning October 20, 1991, as "World Population Awareness Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

#### ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to designate October 1991 as "Crime Prevention Month."

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

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

S. 1722. An act to provide emergency unemployment compensation, and for other purposes.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. ROSE, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills



and joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 189. Joint resolution designating October 8, 1991, as "National Firefighters Day";

H.R. 2387. An act to authorize appropriations for certain programs for the conservation of striped bass, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 3259. An act to authorize appropriations for drug abuse education and prevention programs relating to youth gangs and to runaway and homeless youth; and for other purposes.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 10, 1991, 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:

2186. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Switzerland for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 92-01), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2187. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2188. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2189. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2190. A letter from the Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Department of the Interior, transmitting notice of proposed refunds of excess royalty payments in OCS areas, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2191. A letter from the Chairman, Administrative Conference of the United States, transmitting the annual report on fees and other expenses awarded pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 504(e) covering the period from October 1, 1989 through September 30, 1990, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 504(e); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2192. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a copy of a proclamation that extends nondiscriminatory treatment to the products of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; also enclosed is the text of the "Agreement on

Trade Relations Between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics," which was signed on June 1, 1990, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2437(a) (H. Doc. 102-148); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3371. A bill to control and prevent crime; with amendments (Rept. 102-242, pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

## SUBSEQUENT ACTION ON A REPORTED BILL SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 3371. The Committees on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, Education and Labor, Energy and Commerce, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and Public Works and Transportation discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3371. H.R. 3371 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. Ordered to be printed.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HUGHES (for himself and Mr. MOORHEAD):

H.R. 3531. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Patent and Trademark Office in the Department of Commerce for fiscal year 1992, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOEHNER (for himself, Mr. KLUG, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RIGGS, and Mr. NUSSLE):

H.R. 3532. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require disclosure of information by the Congress; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 3533. A bill to prevent foreign persons from owning national landmarks, areas included in the National Park System, and a significant portion of U.S. cultural business enterprises; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3534. A bill to prohibit discrimination on the basis of certain factors with respect to any aspect of a surety bond transaction; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 3535. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to ensure, through a USHealth Program and through qualified employer health plans, access for all Americans to benefits for high quality health care and long-term care while containing the costs of the health care system; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means, Energy and Commerce, and Education and Labor.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3536. A bill to direct the Comptroller General to conduct a survey to obtain data on the experiences of business firms, and especially the experiences of small business concerns, in obtaining surety bonds from corporate surety companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. OBERSTAR (for himself, Mr. ROE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, and Mr. GEREN of Texas):

H.R. 3537. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a Civil Tiltrotor Development Advisory Committee in the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. RUSSO (for himself, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Mr. HASTERT):

H.R. 3538. A bill to amend the Illinois and Michigan Canal Heritage Corridor Act of 1984 to authorize appropriations for capital improvement projects; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 3539. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to assist the development of small business concerns owned and controlled by women, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. WEISS:

H.R. 3540. A bill to establish a program of grants for providing treatment for the abuse of drugs through projects that make available primary health services to the individuals undergoing such treatment; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself and Mr. MICHEL (both by request), Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. PENNY, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. SANTORUM, and Mr. KOPETSKI):

H.J. Res. 346. Joint resolution approving the extension of nondiscriminatory treatment with respect to the products of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINETA (for himself, Mr. WHITTEN, and Mr. MCDADE):

H.J. Res. 347. Joint resolution providing for the appointment of Hanna Holborn Gray as a citizen regent of the Smithsonian Institution; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RITTER (for himself and Mr. VALENTINE):

H.J. Res. 348. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning February 23, 1992, as "National Manufacturing Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. WOLF):

H. Con. Res. 217. Concurrent resolution urging all parties in Yugoslavia to continue support for the current cease-fire and engage in negotiations on the future of Yugoslavia, calling upon the United Nations to play an expanded role, along with the European Community, in resolving the Yugoslav problem, and encouraging the administration to fully mobilize United States political and economic influence to address the crisis; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KOLBE:

H. Con. Res. 218. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that any new budget summit agreement between the

President and the Congress should reduce the size of projected Federal budget deficits and control entitlement spending; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. HOYER:

H. Res. 243. Resolution designating majority membership on certain standing committees of the House; considered and agreed to.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. GONZALEZ introduced a bill (H.R. 3541) for the relief of Malcolm W. Burkhalter; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

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

H.R. 74: Mr. KYL.  
H.R. 78: Mr. SWETT.  
H.R. 193: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 200: Mr. MATSUI.  
H.R. 267: Mr. WISE.  
H.R. 311: Mr. COX of California.  
H.R. 394: Mr. LENT.  
H.R. 418: Mr. CHAPMAN and Mr. SYNAR.  
H.R. 603: Mr. SPENCE.  
H.R. 608: Mr. SABO.  
H.R. 840: Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. MACHTLEY, and Mr. CHAPMAN.  
H.R. 895: Mr. ZIMMER.  
H.R. 1004: Mr. BOEHNER.  
H.R. 1084: Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 1240: Mr. GEJDESEN, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.  
H.R. 1300: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.  
H.R. 1346: Mr. BUSTAMANTE.  
H.R. 1406: Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. SHARP, and Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 1468: Mr. WELDON.  
H.R. 1515: Mr. DOOLITTLE.  
H.R. 1516: Mr. BRYANT and Mr. FIELDS.  
H.R. 1549: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.  
H.R. 1618: Mr. PAXON, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. RINALDO, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. BAKER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. WALSH, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. ESPY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MOORHEAD, and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER.  
H.R. 1733: Mr. KYL and Mr. RANGEL.  
H.R. 1896: Mr. GINGRICH.  
H.R. 1900: Mr. DOOLITTLE.  
H.R. 2037: Mr. ECKART and Mr. MRAZEK.  
H.R. 2164: Mr. DOOLITTLE.  
H.R. 2371: Mr. COX of California.  
H.R. 2419: Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. BOXER, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.  
H.R. 2464: Mr. HATCHER, Mr. PRICE, Mr. BEVILL, and Mr. PURSELL.  
H.R. 2503: Mr. HOUGHTON.  
H.R. 2748: Mr. LANCASTER.  
H.R. 2755: Mr. PAXON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. SPRATT.  
H.R. 2804: Mr. DELLUMS.  
H.R. 2855: Mr. FISH.  
H.R. 2872: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. RAMSTAD.  
H.R. 2891: Ms. KAPTUR.  
H.R. 2936: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. ECKART.  
H.R. 2943: Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut.  
H.R. 2959: Mr. ROE and Mr. DAVIS.  
H.R. 3026: Mrs. KENNELLY and Mr. KLUG.  
H.R. 3052: Ms. DELAULO, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GORDON, Mr. STARK, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3101: Mr. ENGEL.  
H.R. 3109: Mrs. BYRON.  
H.R. 3122: Mr. SCHAEFER.  
H.R. 3137: Mr. EVANS and Mr. DWYER of New Jersey.

H.R. 3216: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. HEFNER, and Mr. LEWIS of California.

H.R. 3251: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MOODY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ROE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. MFUME, and Mr. SOLARZ.

H.R. 3282: Mr. ROSE, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. RHODES, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. COBLE, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GALLO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. SWETT.

H.R. 3311: Mr. SHAW and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3330: Mr. EWING and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 3334: Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3363: Mr. SCHULZE.

H.R. 3369: Mr. ZIMMER and Mr. COX of Illinois.

H.R. 3425: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. OLIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 3454: Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. LEACH, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ROTH, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 3505: Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.J. Res. 123: Ms. HORN.

H.J. Res. 140: Mr. COX of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOAGLAND, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. ROHRBACHER, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. MARTIN.

H.J. Res. 177: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. HORN, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. ANDERSON, and Mr. STUMP.

H.J. Res. 198: Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MINETA, Mr. EARLY, Ms. HORN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. PERKINS, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. RHODES, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. NATCHER, and Ms. OAKAR.

H.J. Res. 201: Mr. APPEGATE, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. MCLEWEN, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. BROWDER, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. FISH, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. TANNER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. FALCOMAEGA, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MINETA, Mr. COOPER, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. HENRY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. VOLKMER, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. AUCCOIN, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. KANJORSKI, and Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma.

H.J. Res. 253: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. WELDON, Mr.

MOODY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. WISE, and Mr. SHARP.

H.J. Res. 260: Mr. WELDON.

H.J. Res. 261: Mr. CARR, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MORRISON, Mr. NAGLE, and Mr. ZELIFF.

H.J. Res. 284: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. MARTIN, Mr. MINETA, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. REGULA, Mr. PAXON, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, and Mr. ROWLAND.

H.J. Res. 287: Mr. BAKER.

H.J. Res. 300: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. RHODES, Mr. HORTON, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FISH, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. VOLKMER, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.J. Res. 307: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LENT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HORTON, Ms. HORN, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, and Mr. ORTON.

H.J. Res. 343: Mr. BROWDER, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. DIXON, Mr. GREEN of New York, Ms. HORN, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. McMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. OLIN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. TALLON, and Mr. WHEAT.

H. Con. Res. 65: Mr. HUGHES.

H. Con. Res. 161: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. STARK, Mr. LARROCCA, Mr. DELAY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. FIELDS, Ms. DELAULO, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. ESPY, Mr. RAY, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. WEBER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MANTON, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. MINETA, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. ANTHONY, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. NAGLE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. PACKARD, and Mr. VENTO.

H. Con. Res. 188: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MORAN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. WEISS, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. AUCCOIN, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. MCGRATH.

H. Con. Res. 194: Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. PAXON, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. GILLMOR, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H. Con. Res. 208: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. WEISS, Mr. EWING, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MOODY, and Mr. COX of Illinois.

H. Res. 129: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ROEMER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. SCHUMER, and Mr. SPENCE.

H. Res. 234: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. PENNY, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. HYDE.



# DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

H.R. 858: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
H.R. 1330: Mr. YATRON.

## AMENDMENTS

Under clause 6 of rule XXIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2369

By Mr. NICHOLS:

—Section 1(a), strike out "is hereby established" and insert in lieu thereof "is established, subject to subsection (c)."

—Insert the following new subsection at the end of section 1 of the bill:

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—(1) The establishment of the monument under subsection (a) shall take effect only after—

(A) the Secretary, within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, employs a professional polling firm to conduct a scientific poll of residents of Chase County, Kansas, to determine if they favor the establishment of the monument in accordance with this Act;

(B) the firm hired under paragraph conducts such poll within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(C) the Secretary determines pursuant to such poll that a majority of the residents of Chase County, Kansas, favor the establishment of the monument in accordance with this Act.

(2) The Secretary shall publish the results of the poll conducted pursuant to paragraph (1) in the Federal Register, together with a statement indicating whether the monument is established pursuant to this subsection. In addition, the Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate concerning the poll and the establishment of the monument.

—Page , after line , insert the following:

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect in the fiscal year following the first fiscal year after the date of enactment of this Act in which Federal revenues are equal to or greater than Federal expenditures.