SENATE—*Tuesday, January 28, 1992*

(Legislative day of Friday, January 3, 1992)

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. BYRD].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The prayer to the Almighty Host will be led by the Chaplain, Rev. Richard C. Halverson. Dr. Halverson, please.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain.—Psalm 127:1.

Eternal God, Creator, Sustainer, and Consummator of history, as Congress gathers this evening to hear the President—as the world listens—grant that the words of the psalmist be heard by all of us. "Except the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it * * *." As the Nation confronts grave crises, may we recognize the limitations of the best and the finest humans can do. As the State of the Union Address is given and the battle of ideas and views and positions follow, help us hear the voice of the Lord, reminding us of our need for divine intervention in all our affairs.

Gracious Lord, bring to our remembrance the faith of our fathers who looked to Thee when there was nowhere else to turn. Restore to us their faith, and renew in us their dedication to transcendent truth and reality. Whatever carried them through their crises, may we find recourse and repose in that same resource.

In His name who is the Lord of life. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, today the period for morning business will run until 12 noon. At that time the Senate will resume consideration of S. 2, the education bill. From 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., the Senate will stand in recess to accommodate the respective party conferences.

When the Senate reconvenes at 2:15 p.m., there will be 10 minutes remaining for debate on the Nickles amendment No. 1479, and following that 10 minutes of debate a motion to table that amendment will be made by Senator BENTSEN.

Once action is concluded on the Nickles amendment, Senator DOMENICI will raise a Budget Act point of order against the Wirth-Wellstone amendments. There will then be 90 minutes for debate on a motion to waive the Budget Act. After all time is used or yielded back, the Senate will vote on that motion to waive.

Once these amendments are disposed of, four other first-degree amendments remain in order and will have to be disposed of prior to final action on the bill. These first-degree amendments are open to relative second-degree amendments as was provided for in the previous unanimous consent agreement governing the bill.

It is my hope that action can be completed on this bill today. Therefore, Senators should be aware that rollcall votes will occur with respect to amendments to the education bill and hopefully final passage during the afternoon and evening today.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my leader time and I reserve all of the leader time of the distinguished Republican leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the time of the two leaders will be reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to extend beyond the hour of 12 o'clock noon with Senators permitted to speak therein. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] will be recognized at some point to speak for up to 30 minutes. The Senator from Georgia will be recognized to speak for up to 15 minutes, and the following 90 minutes will be under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

The majority leader is recognized.

PRESIDENT BUSH'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, this evening the President will address the Congress and the American people with his third State of the Union Address. He will unveil his long-awaited domestic economic program.

His immediate challenge, and ours, is to respond to the recession. We must move the economy out of recession and return to growth, job creation, and expansion. That is a goal on which we all agree.

We Democrats in Congress have already recognized the need for unemployment insurance extension for the long-term unemployed. In fact, congressional committees are scheduled to take up that legislation this week. Americans out of work through no fault of their own need that help. We will work to bring it to them promptly.

We have long advocated relief for middle-class families who have been overtaxed throughout the last decade. I hope the President will propose a significant tax cut for middle-income families and will include other elements of an economic revival program to help turn the economy around.

We welcome his attention to the need for economic stimulus at this time. A tax cut for middle-income working Americans; a temporary investment tax credit to speed up business investment; programs to revive the housing and construction industries are all important and achievable. We need immediate action to restore growth and confidence.

I hope the President will also join us in urging action to assist States and local governments struggling with recession-hit budgets. We hope that is part of the President's proposal.

It appears that the President will agree to a further shift of resources away from defense spending in the wake of the collapse of the Soviet Union. That is a hopeful sign.

We need a comprehensive program of conversion from military to civilian purposes. The President can spur such a shift. I hope he will do so.

Our Nation made an efficient and successful conversion in the wake of World War II. It laid the basis for sustained real economic growth for more than a decade. We can and should repeat that effort in today's circumstances.

Every part of the country will feel the economic fallout of defense job losses, base closings or contract cuts over the next few years. A plan to efficiently utilize the people and expertise that will become militarily redundant will give hope and confidence to the affected communities and individuals that their future is one of promise, not despair.

I hope the President will recognize and offer real answers to the income decline that threatens the living standards of middle-income families.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

That will require a program for long-term investment for growth. We need that longer view to create the basis for sustained improvement in Americans' living standards.

Long-term economic growth demands a revived civilian economy. We have to invest in research. We should be exploiting the discoveries we have already made as well.

For example, the fiber-optic technology for a broad telecommunications infrastructure already exists. It is being installed and used now by some of our largest corporations.

The public policy challenge is to bring that technology to smaller businesses and consumers—to build the public network of the new technology as earlier generations built the telephone line network. The technology to move people more efficiently in urban areas exists. We should be planning to take advantage of it. High-speed rail is a reality in the rest of the developed world. It is time it came to America.

The end of the cold war frees up resources and skills that present an enormous opportunity for the revival of American economic leadership and growth. I hope the President's message will point us in that direction.

The revival of American economic leadership and growth depends, ultimately, on how we invest in the human beings whose work produces economic growth.

It is human intelligence and human will which makes innovations possible and develops them for wider use. Well-educated employees are more efficient; well-trained researchers are more inventive; skilled workers are more flexible. An economy which can adapt to new circumstances is an economy that grows with change instead of being overwhelmed by it.

Education reform at the elementary and secondary level is a crucial ingredient of long-term economic growth.

Better schools, more highly trained and motivated teachers, increased parental involvement, focused funding—all are needed to give the next generation the attitudes, skills, knowledge, and outlook that preserve and strengthen American values. We hope to complete action on this important effort in the Senate today.

But to learn, children must begin school ready to learn. We have already lost one generation to neglect. The President gives strong verbal support to Head Start. I hope his message will lay emphasis on the central importance of that approach.

Head Start must be available to all eligible children—today it reaches a third of them. It is a proven program to prevent school failure. Children need it now. They cannot afford to wait a few more years, because in a few more years they will already be in school and failing. I hope the President endorses our democratic goal of fully funding Head Start. A commitment to fund 80 percent of enrollment for a single year is not a long-term commitment. Our children need more and so does the Nation.

Economic revival and growth also mean we must deal with long-neglected problems now. If we do not, they will stall growth in the years to come.

No problem today is more acute than health care. Too many people who need coverage cannot afford it. Too many who could afford it are locked out by insurers who will cover only the healthy. The system permits overuse by the well-insured; discourages preventive care for those most at risk; and distorts both hiring decisions by employers and career decisions by employees.

The system does not efficiently serve private citizens or private business. It needs reform.

We need a plan for reform that meets the three standards essential to real and meaningful change. Access to affordable health insurance for every American, effective strategies to restrain runaway cost increases, and increased emphasis on preventive care.

Health care is the tip of a large iceberg. There are many other neglected problems to face.

The airline industry is still operating from dangerously overcrowded airports. A year after the war in the Persian Gulf, we are as dependent as ever on oil imports. Within 2 years, the residents of almost half our cities will face higher local taxes as landfills close and waste disposal costs skyrocket. Wastewater treatment also continues to be a priority for communities across the country.

I hope the President addresses these realities this evening. America's economy and America's future is more than the sum of the figures that make up the Federal budget. It is the wellbeing and prosperity of families and communities across the land.

All decisions have consequences. The decision to cut resources for families with children has given us the only society in the developed world whose children face a higher risk of poverty than any other group in the population.

The decision to save money on alternative energy research shifts to the private sector the high costs of oil imports.

The decision to save on moderate income housing shifts costs to local taxpayers for homeless shelters.

The decision that our companies cannot afford unpaid family leave when all our economic competitors pay for family leave says that our Government has given up on the quality of life of ordinary working families. It says that people who choose to have children or have frail parents are a drag on society, not contributors. But that is wrong. They are not a drag on society. They are contributors to a healthy society.

Those people are the heart and soul of America. I hope the President's message will recognize that central fact.

We are ready to work with the President for a well-conceived plan of economic recovery and long-term growth. We hope his State of the Union Message will offer a substantive plan.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. RIEGLE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE].

COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, I want to follow on, in something of the same vein as the majority leader, and say that tonight we will be hearing a State of the Union Message. From my observation we are a nation struggling today and a nation in very serious economic difficulty. I think a careful look at the data from a number of directions indicates to us that we are in the process of losing our economic future. We need aggressive new policies to change that along the lines just suggested by Senator MITCHELL.

We clearly need a new economic plan for America where people in this country can sit down together, business, Government, and labor, and come up with a strategy to put this country on a different economic track. I think it is obvious for all to see that the Bush-Quayle plan has failed and we need a new plan. People today are worse off than they were nearly 4 years ago when we embarked on the plan of this administration, and a new plan is clearly needed.

Part of that plan clearly must be in the area of health care reform. We need a comprehensive overhaul of our health care system in America today to accomplish two primary goals. First, access to the system by all Americans so that everyone has a form of health insurance coverage for every person in our country. And second, we need a situation where we go in and deal with the excessive costs that have built up in the system through a host of inefficiencies, through all kinds of cost shifting that goes on through the system and which now have reached the point where we are spending about 12 percent of our gross national product on health care, far higher than any other nation, and yet we have nearly 40 million people who are left out altogether, and tens of millions more who have health insurance but it is either limited or it is becoming so expensive that they cannot continue to maintain it. So we have a major problem in that cost control area that has to be dealt with.

I must say just in my own personal experience in the last 2 weeks we have had two occasions within our family to

require the use of skilled medical help, one the delivery of a baby. My wife had our second child just this last week out at the Fairfax County Hospital. I was certainly impressed by the tremendous quality and effort of the medical personnel there, and the care that the infants were getting.

Every child in America coming along needs care such as that, not just at the time that a birth takes place but the prenatal care that is so essential in ensuring there is a normal birth, that the child comes at full term and has the normal birth weight, has an opportunity to embark on a life with full strength and with the kind of help that may be needed if for one reason or another the birth process itself is difficult.

Just yesterday I was in my home city of Flint to visit my father who is hospitalized there with some serious difficulties that come with advancing age. I talked with the doctors that have been treating him, wonderful people, very skilled, applying themselves with a measure of professional competence to try to extend his life and to help, for which my family and I are very grateful.

But I have to again ask the question what is happening throughout our system? What is happening to those who have no insurance? What is happening to those who live in areas where there are no adequate medical resources? In areas of my State hospitals are closing, and the skilled physicians are not available.

The occupant of the chair, Senator BYRD, represents West Virginia. It, too, in its rural areas has problems such as that where people today need medical care, whether it is expectant mothers, or whether it is older citizens who need particular needs met, or people of any age in between, are often finding that either they do not have access to the system because they do not have health insurance, or they often come late with the medical problem which is often far worse than it otherwise might be.

There was a story on NBC News this morning, just a terribly tragic story of a family with a young baby girl who inadvertently swallowed something and needed care. They went to the nearest medical facility. That facility was not equipped to be able to identify what the problem was. The little girl continued to struggle and eventually died.

To listen to the parents talk about that story of this young girl's life that was lost that need not have been lost—it increasingly is the story of America, of either health needs not met, or people who need jobs who cannot find them, people including recent veterans of Desert Storm who have come back, had the parades a year ago, who we see now unemployed, homeless, out in our society seemingly of no interest to our country as a whole in terms of trying to help them get a foothold and get established with a decent life in our country.

We have major economic problems and probably no area makes that clearer than the need for this comprehensive health insurance that can cover everybody in our country. If you take that problem in the health care system with the shrinking economic strength of the middle class, we have a situation right now where we are sliding backward, the number of uninsured are rising. Those that have partial health insurance at work are finding that they may be covered but the members of their family are not covered.

We have described before the situation of a working mother in Detroit, Cynthia Fyfe, who appeared before one of our hearings. She has a job and partial health insurance for herself. She is a single parent and she has a 6-year-old son Anthony, and he has no health insurance. It is not provided through her workplace. She does not make enough money to be able to buy health care coverage for him, so they go without health coverage for that little fellow.

You look at that and multiply that times millions of people in the country, and it is not right. It does not have to be that way. The President, if he wants to, can change that tonight by stepping forward to lead on this issue, as he ought to do.

When you go back and look at our founding documents, they have to do with the well-being of our people. We formed the country, and we made our basic arrangements with each other. We affiliated as a people in order to look after the well-being of every citizen of this country. Life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, it is built right into the founding documents, virtually on every line.

But if you need health care and you cannot get it, you are probably risking your life, and you are certainly not going to be able to pursue happiness, or to otherwise enjoy the blessings of just the great privilege of being able to have a life and to have a life in a free country.

So we have to deal with this health care issue. Failure to do so is also damaging our business system. In the automobile industry today, we have tremendous problems that are well-known. But one of the problems is that, because our health care system is out of control, the health care cost per vehicle produced in the United States is about $1,000. The highest level it is in any other competing country that builds cars is about $500. Most are lower than that, because other nations have national health insurance plans that do not bring the cost in as a direct product cost in an industry like that.

We are losing competitiveness in that area in part because of this enormous cost burden. We cannot afford inflated costs in our health care system that feed back in our business system and make our companies less competitive and help close them down, and shrink job opportunities in the United States.

We can correct that problem with a comprehensive health insurance plan. We have brought one forward. Senators MITCHELL, ROCKEFELLER, KENNEDY, and myself have devised one. We have put it forward at the present time. We have, in addition, 7 other cosponsors that have joined us here in the Senate behind that legislation. It is a good bill. It is S. 1227. It deals with these two problems of access to the system, universal coverage, so that everybody in America is seen and acknowledged as important and can have health insurance protection. It also deals with the problem of cost control. We implement a series of cost-effectiveness and cost-control measures that will reduce health care costs over the next 5 years by an estimated $80 billion.

So we feel that there is a way—by revising the system and by taking out some of the inefficiency and some of the areas where needless cost accumulates—that we can save money and, in turn, provide broader coverage to all of our people.

But no child or no expectant mother in America should come down the track of their life experience and find that they are deprived of the basic things they need to have, such as an opportunity for good health care, to get started in life, and to have the potential to come forward with decent education and other opportunities in our society, and with the health care that may be needed along the way, to have the chance, to prosper, to have the chance to eventually build a family of their own, to be able to contribute to the country, to be able to build the country's strength.

We cannot build a strong country if people are out there today, such as the millions of people who are, in effect, walking wounded, who cannot get access to health care when they need it; or when they finally go, they are so sick because they have delayed going because they do not have health insurance, and they show up in an emergency room, and they are in far worse health, and it is much more expensive to try to care for them at that time. And if they do not have coverage, those costs, if they cannot pay them, have to be cost shifted through the system, and in the end they are paid by everyone else who has health insurance, inflating those costs.

It is a vicious cycle moving in that direction and one we must break. That is why we need some leadership tonight. When I say "comprehensive health care plan," I do not mean just a little tinkering around the edges. That is not going to get the job done. That may sound good, that may look good in terms of a presentation when it is crafted very carefully with the words

that are said, but if it is not a comprehensive plan, if it does not set as a goal providing health insurance coverage for every person in this country, and a strong set of cost controls to get cost efficiency into the system, then it is not going to mean much.

You might hear the buzz words, and there might be sort of a tip of the hat in the direction of the problem. But unless there is a comprehensive plan offered that is relevant to every citizen in the country, then it will not be adequate to the need.

I want to read briefly from a letter I received from a woman in Fraser, MI, signed both by herself and by her husband. I received this letter last August. But I receive them each day each week. I want to share a few words because it is on the issue of health care.

She is talking about the fact that her husband had been laid off from his job and laid off now for some months prior to the time that she wrote this letter.

I want to cut into the middle:

> Because of Walter's lay-off we have to pay for our own health insurance. Since it has been almost six months of no work plus the expense of health insurance our savings and our peace of mind are nearly depleted.
>
> I don't feel that the greatest country in the world, the United States, can care for its own citizens. If you're an American, you should feel secure enough to know that you will be able to seek medical attention if necessary.
>
> We are not alone in our feelings. There are millions of Americans who through no fault of their own are not covered by any health insurance. We hope you are able to get your bill S. 1227 passed. Please help us.

Signed by both the husband and wife in Fraser, MI.

I have mail stacked this high coming in like this. When we asked for people who want to testify at field hearings we held, we had so many people who wanted to testify, we could only accommodate just a very few.

Let me finish with this.

Today is a special day for America because we are going to take a look at the state of the Nation. What is the state of the Nation? What is the state of our economy? What is the state of opportunity for our people? What is happening in the area of health care? What are our prospects? How are we doing in international trade?

It is a very depressing situation that we see. We see the massive unemployment. We see all of these people without health insurance. We see missed opportunities all over the place.

I hope that tonight America will make a decision to get off the path we are on and get on a new path, on a new economic path, and a new path about equity and justice for our people.

You know, for most of the 1980's, from 1980 to 1988, we took sort of an 8-year trip to the movies with President Reagan. Reaganomics sounded good. "Morning in America," followed by the Bush campaign theme, "Don't worry. Be happy." And it was essentially fraudulent, and now we see that, because we see what happened to our economy, how it has been hollowed out, how we have squandered the time and squandered our opportunities.

It has not hurt those at the very top with high incomes. They have been well protected from this. But most everybody else is sliding backward. That is what is reflected today in the economic data and the public opinion polls. I think it is time, as a nation, that we find our conscience again and care about each other and care about strangers, care about people in this country whose names we do not know, whether they happen to be homeless people living in cardboard boxes or under bridges. A large number of the homeless are veterans, by the way, of military service to this country, who were important enough at the time that we asked them to serve and defend America, and now we have turned our back on them. It is not right. Or the person that needs health care and does not have it, or the person that needs a job.

We saw all those people standing outside the hotel in Chicago the other day in subzero temperatures, winding for blocks, and several thousand people standing their shivering to turn in a résumé, desperate to find a job, and only a handful of jobs available.

This country ought to commit itself to have a job for every single American in our land. Everybody standing in that line should have a job. We need them working. They need to work. We need the economic strength. They need the income. Why is it that we are so uncaring or incompetent as a country that we turn our back on our fellow citizens, those in need? It is not right. It is against the very grain and purpose of this Nation. It is one for all and all for one, and we have to care about each other and we have to help each other. If you get an elitist crowd running the Government that does not believe in that, they have to move out and somebody has to move in who believes in that fundamental purpose of this country, that we look after each other and help each other, because that makes a strong and decent nation.

We have lost our way. We lost our way during the 1980's and we have not found it as yet.

So I do not want to hear just a lot more of the same thing tonight, maybe dressed up with a few new words. We need a change in direction, a fundamental change in direction. We need a new economic plan. And part of it has to be comprehensive national health insurance, and not just for some, not health insurance for those up on the top tier or for others who are well situated. We need health insurance for 250 million Americans because each one is important and none should be left out. We have the chance to do it, and I certainly hope we will.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROCKEFELLER].

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Chair.

I strongly associate myself with the remarks of the Senator from Michigan who, as always, speaks with a very strong moral undertone to what the direction of the Nation might be, not just the details of that direction but the underlying moral force for that.

AMERICANS ARE ANXIOUS FOR LEADERSHIP IN HEALTH CARE

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, tonight, both Congress and the American people will listen intently to the President's State of the Union Address.

I think we all hope that it will be far more than a vague glimpse at the year ahead that the President will lay out a vision for economic recovery and revival.

As the President knows, Americans are also anxious for his leadership in health care. George Bush has the great fortune to be President at a moment when the American people and both Houses of Congress are ready to transform our health care system.

With his speech tonight, he has an opportunity to begin a health care revolution which will save dollars and lives, and benefit tens of millions of Americans—workers and employers, parents and children—for years to come.

Today—and I say this to George Bush and his aides—I suggest a three-part test of the worth of any of the President's health care proposals.

The first test is whether his proposals really do ensure universal coverage, with special emphasis on children, pregnant women, and preventive care.

The second is whether the President's proposals lower the cost of care for businesses and families, and whether he makes a special effort to help America's small business. And the third test is whether he offers an approach to bringing about long-term care for all Americans when they face that need.

Last month, at an Atlanta field hearing I participated in with Majority Leader MITCHELL and my colleague, Senator FOWLER, I heard firsthand what health care costs are doing to our recession-wracked economy.

Georgia-Pacific CEO Marshall Hahn told us how health care costs were pricing his company out of the international wood and paper industries. How companies in other nations, whose governments pick up the tab for employee insurance, are forcing this U.S. firm out of market after market.

We also heard from Karl Hall head of a four-person firm who can't get afford-

able insurance at all—because of his treatable hypertension. Mr. President, his employees would have better access to health care if they had no job whatsoever.

If a Presidential health care initiative cannot keep Georgia-Pacific competitive around the world, if it cannot include Karl Hall's employees without costing them their jobs, it flunks the test. It needs to be sent back, and the administration should start over again.

Like George Bush, Natalie Baker has Graves disease. Unlike George Bush she paid for her treatment out of her own household's pocket. Diagnosed when her husband switched jobs, her condition was branded pre- existing, and no one would insure her.

The cost of treatment wiped out the Baker's savings. A single accident—a broken leg or a ruptured appendix, would have cost them their home.

If the Bush proposal cannot bring treatment to Natalie Baker; if it cannot ensure that her health does not jeopardize her home; if it cannot free their family of the fear they experience every day; it flunks the test. It needs to be sent back.

A divorced mother in my home State of West Virginia cannot get insurance for her family because an underwriter's chart says that she is overweight.

Her perfectly healthy 8-year-old must live a sheltered life, the fun and games of childhood restricted for fear that any injury will eat up his mother's meager savings.

And unless George Bush is ready to propose a way to make sure our Nation's children have a chance to grow up healthy and active, I am going to help lead the fight to send his plan back to the drawing board.

You don't have to be a doctor to know the difference between comprehensive reform and cosmetic surgery.

For months now we have been moving with increasing speed toward systematic reform. We have jumped the hurdles of public apathy, political invisibility, and the perception that bold, constructive change is impossible. The single, final barrier to health care reform is George Bush.

If his proposals sap our momentum with empty symbolism and too much incremental change, we must fill up the floor of the Senate with our outrage; we must lead our constituents to light up the White House switchboard.

The U.S. Congress cannot, under any circumstances, allow our momentum to be sapped by symbolic change and political posturing.

Tonight, we must separate the jargon from the reality, the rhetoric from the truth. The test is simple.

It is up to us to say "pass" or "fail." We will ourselves have failed if we pass a Presidential program that does not meet the basic standards of universal coverage, lower costs, and long-term care protection. Any credible new domestic order must include these urgent goals.

We stand at the edge of a quantum leap into the future—our Nation is poised to agree to fundamental reform that will bring a hundred million Americans and a $6 trillion economy into the 21st century. We must seize this moment and change this Nation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER].

THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I, too, look forward to the President's speech this evening. I would say that the burden is on Congress to enact a program. I attended this morning a briefing by the President. I think the Congress will be under a great deal of pressure to enact the President's program by a date certain. I hope that that occurs. But I think there is a burden on every level of American society in terms of the recession we are now in. We will receive strong leadership from our President. We must also receive strong leadership from the Congress.

There is also a burden in terms of the entire U.S. Government to improve our decisionmaking capabilities. Many of the types of decisions that need to be taken are not taken in a timely fashion. Our deficit has grown beyond all imagination. There is much need for reform in Washington.

There is also a burden on our corporate presidents, who set an example. In my opinion, they have been taking too high salaries. There is a cozy relationship between boards of directors and corporate presidents.

I believe strongly that the burden is on workers and labor, also, in terms of quality control. The burden is on local school districts to work to improve our schools in a fashion that a large portion of our young people will not be graduating without the basic skills in mathematics and reading.

So as we look forward to our President's address this evening, I am prepared to take the actions necessary. But the burden will be on Congress after the President's speech, and I do look forward to that speech.

SURINAME

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, Suriname's new civilian government is facing threats of a military coup from that country's Armed Forces Commander Desi Bouterse. Since my visit to Suriname in December, it is increasingly rumored that Suriname's military may again impose its will, shattering democracy and undermining representative government. Twice before, including as recently as Christmas Eve 1990, leaders of the armed forces have expelled cabinet ministers and the national legislature. This must not be allowed to happen again.

During my visit to Paramaribo, I met with Suriname's President, Dr. Ronald Venetiaan, and with key cabinet ministers. These leaders, elected in 1991 after the military relinquished power, have formed a government which is constantly looking over its shoulder at armed forces headquarters. The barracks, located midway between the President's office and the Civilian Assembly Building, bristle with high-technology communications devices.

In the 17 years since gaining independence from The Netherlands, the military chronic imposition of its will and ruinous socialism have driven out many of Suriname's most promising citizens. Most have fled to Holland. Opportunities and investment have lagged for the same reasons. Many exiles fund Suriname's economy by sending Dutch guilders home, where they are processed through the black market to avoid unrealistic official exchange rates. Surinamers suffer a deep lack of confidence in their country's political and economic future.

Under Army Commander Desi Bouterse, Suriname's small army seems to hold most of the trump cards. When Bouterse elevated himself in the armed forces and seized power the first time, he staked out a decidedly pro-Cuban position. Over the years he and his top deputies have become allied with Colombian drug lords. The army is widely believed to permit narcotic traffickers to refuel on the country's remote jungle airstrips. In addition, military officials are known to turn a blind eye to the content of commercial aircraft and ship cargoes.

The military's record while in power has been extremely poor. It has repeatedly violated basic civil and political rights of the people. In Suriname's civic climate, the armed forces inevitably takes sides. Suriname has an extremely diverse population: American Indians live together with descendants of black slaves, mixed race creoles, East Indian Hindustanis, Indonesians, and Chinese. With only 400,000 people, strong ethnic identity has resulted in coalition governments. Sadly, that diversity is used to rationalize favoritism and political payoffs.

During last year's elections, the military formed its own political party and zealously bought votes. How were the bribes of frozen chickens, cars and bicycles financed? The best guess is from drug trade profits. Bouterse's affinity for drug lords is further confirmed by his recent appointment of a top aide who was released after 5 years in a U.S. prison for a drug conviction.

Recent discussions, on the island of Bonaire, between Suriname's civilian government and the Dutch have begun to reinforce economic and democratic reforms. The United States and other countries need to help this process con-

tinue, through both direct efforts and multilateral diplomacy.

The first goal must be to warn off the military from its pattern of adventurism. To that end, I have contacted President Bush asking him to send strong signals that another military coup will not be tolerated in Suriname. Embargoes have been imposed in the past, but have not been effective in dissuading the army. A more potent message must be sent. Rumors of a new coup make this an urgent priority.

Events in Haiti provide a useful lesson. Had the United States or a coalition of countries curbed President Aristide's verbal and policy excesses, the military may have had no excuse to force him out. Putting down strong, effective markers early in Haiti's coup might have shortened it and encouraged thousands of refugees to remain at home until power reverted to civilians.

The United States cannot remake Suriname. But it can and must take effective steps to discourage a military takeover. America's security interests also include assisting the civilian government in its efforts to control drug trafficking and to promote economic growth.

Recently, I urged President Bush to place immediate economic sanctions on Suriname in the event of a military coup. The United States needs to send an unmistakable signal that a military coup will be opposed vigorously and effectively. The success of Suriname's civilian government and democratic institutions is important to our foreign policy throughout Latin America.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my letter to President Bush printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 9, 1992.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I recently returned from a trip to Paramaribo, Suriname where I met with President Ronald Venetiaan. As you know, President Venetiaan's government is now facing increased threats of a military coup from Commander Desi Bouterse.

Should there be an illegal military overthrow of the democratically elected government, I urge you to immediately place an embargo on Suriname. The success of Suriname's civilian government and democratic institutions is important to our foreign policy throughout Latin America.

Suriname's sad history of military intervention against elected governments, combined with the military's apparent collusion with international drug traffickers and participation in drug trafficking, must be opposed.

During my visit to Suriname, I was impressed with the commitment of the Dutch government to civilian authority and representative rule in their former colony. The United States should do no less than cooperate in all appropriate international efforts to strengthen free institutions, send an unmistakable signal that a military coup is completely unacceptable, and that any coup will be opposed vigorously and effectively.

I will do all I can to support your actions to preserve democracy in Suriname. We need to do all we can to encourage the development of permanent civilian and democratic institutions in Suriname.

Sincerely,

LARRY PRESSLER,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The absence of a quorum has been noted. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CASTRO AND HIS CUBA

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, recently, I spent 4 days in Cuba with some staff members from the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. During that time, I had a 6-hour meeting with Fidel Castro, which was a great deal of listening on my part. I did write an article that appeared in the Miami Herald on January 23, 1992, summarizing that meeting with Mr. Castro and my impressions of Cuba. It is entitled

"A U.S. SENATOR'S IMPRESSION OF CASTRO AND HIS CUBA." I ASK UNANIMOUS CONSENT THAT IT BE PRINTED IN THE RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 23, 1992]

A U.S. SENATOR'S IMPRESSIONS OF CASTRO AND HIS CUBA

(By Larry Pressler)

Now that communism has failed in Eastern Europe, does this create a realistic chance for greater freedom and opportunity for Cubans on their island? Upon my arrival in Havana, one of Cuba's vice presidents met me. From that moment, I was accompanied by people claiming to be with the ministries of foreign affairs or interior. Secret police?

The best way to get a feel of a country is through its people. Sadly, it was apparently too risky to allow a U.S. senator to meet average Cubans. However, despite the best efforts of Castro's functionaries, I found ways to see the Cuban people as they worked and went about their lives. Their misery was apparent.

I was struck by the dilapidated nature of the buildings. None are newly constructed or painted, and almost all predate the 1959 revolution. The only exceptions are special facilities for foreign tourists and sports facilities used during the Pan American Games.

Car owners have been forced to ride bicycles, take buses, or walk, as a result of strict gasoline rationing imposed since the Soviet Union cut its petroleum shipments to Cuba by 50 percent. All Soviet and East European subsidies have been cut drastically.

"Can you show me a supermarket?" I asked my hosts repeatedly. "Later," they replied. Later never came because there are no supermarkets—except the one exclusively for diplomats. Cuba suffers a shortage of almost everything: shoes, milk, beans, and soap are among the rationed items. Castro can't even meet modest ration targets. Even water is scarce. Long lines at government water trucks are the norm.

During nearly six hours of discussions with Cuba's leaders, he conceded that his country was experiencing tough times. But Castro rationalized shortages as the result of wise economic planning done in the best interest of the Cuban people. Why have Cubans switched from cars to bicycles, and from tractors to oxen? Castro contends that bicycles are better exercise and better for the environment, and oxen are more productive than tractors.

Having grown up on a South Dakota family farm, I remarked that this was indeed a revolutionary concept! Cuba will be the first country in history to go from the use of tractors to oxen in farming.

"Could you hold free, fair elections?" I asked Castro. Insulted by the suggestion, he stated that it would be impossible due to current fuel shortages. However, if change does not come by the ballot, downtrodden Cubans may have to act, even though a Ceausescu-type coup would be a nightmare for Castro. When I asked Castro about his long record of human rights violations, he denied that there was a problem. So long as Castro's communism remains, Cuba is without hope.

In our meeting, I saw no signs that Castro is willing to move away from past policies. Castro contends that Cuba is on a long pilgrimage toward the ideal Communist state. Cuban officials claim to have nearly reached the stage of socialism, after which communism will follow.

The regime brags about progress in health care, education, and tourism. I visited two scientific-research centers for the development and production of medicine and vaccines. All the laboratories were empty. Health care may be universal but it is also rudimentary.

Since Castro has isolated himself, the Cuban government is not able to get sufficient supplies of medicine. Even aspirin is hard to find. It is impossible to judge the effectiveness of Castro's much touted advancements in medicine. He will not allow international organizations to test the quality or results of Cuban vaccines.

As far as alleged achievements in Cuban education, school is free of charge. However judging by Cuban officials and school children I met, education is largely a propaganda tool for the regime. Only those children who join the Communist youth organization are permitted to receive higher education.

In a school for the partially blind, children loudly and enthusiastically sang: "I will be faithful to Fidel, the revolution, and socialism." Though the school was for blind children, walls and blackboards were covered with slogans and history of the revolution.

Tourism is Castro's one hope, The regime has built luxury hotels and enforced a form of tourist apartheid in them and on nearby beaches. Average Cubans are not allowed. This is indeed ironic because when Castro came to power 33 years ago, he told the people that he had struggled so the beaches would belong to them. The Castro government, hopes that tourism can become a cash cow with its milk being used to feed the starving totalitarian system. My guess is that average Cubans see through this scheme and resent it.

As for U.S. policy, Castro has given the United States no reason to lift the trade em-

bargo. Ending the blockade would be seen as a victory for Cuban-style communism and would send exactly the wrong message to Nicaragua's Sandinistas, to the Salvadoran Communist guerrillas, and to other similar movements.

After seeing the country for myself, I am not convinced that the lessons of post-Communist reality have been learned in Castro's Cuba.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield the floor?

Mr. PRESSLER. I yield the floor.

Mr. SASSER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER].

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume from the time reserved to the majority leader.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Tennessee, Mr. SASSER, is recognized for such time as he may require under the time under the control of the majority leader.

AMERICAN PEOPLE NOT LOOKING FOR PROMISES

Mr. SASSER. Mr. President, the next 10 hours will be a period of some expectancy, I expect, throughout the country and certainly in this, the Capital City of the United States. Perhaps it is not too much to say that tonight's State of the Union Address will mark the defining moment of George Bush's Presidency, the moment when he persuades us if he really does have a domestic policy for the United States. It is no secret that hopes are very high. I know I speak for the people of my State in wishing the President the very best. If ever a speech mattered to them in the last few years, this is it.

The American people are not looking for promises tonight, they are not looking for grandiose rhetoric, and most certainly they are not looking for artful evasion. The time has come for this President to lay out an economic recovery program and articulate a vision for the future of this country that has been sadly lacking.

Some have called on the President to produce the economic equivalent of the Magna Carta this evening. I expect that is an overstatement that raises expectations beyond what could possibly be realized. But as the very minimum, the President must produce this evening a recovery plan for this country that addresses the problems as they are and produces a program that can be made into legislative reality. I think the current moment demands at least that much.

What is the condition of the country on the eve of this State of the Union Message? Mr. President, I am sad to report that there are 24 million of our country men and women, 1 in 10 Americans, receiving food stamps today for survival. And many of these food stamp recipients are people who have never received food stamps in their lives. We are seeing middle-class citizens, people who held middle-management posts now receiving food stamps, they have been unemployed for so long. You are going to have a hard time making a case to these people that things really are not as bad as they seem. For millions of American families, they are every bit as bad as they seem.

I think it is important to take a close look at the country that George Bush will confront this evening—the country that is waiting for words of hope to fortify a faltering national confidence.

The highly respected, nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office told the country just last week that the economy is dead in the water. In truth, that is an optimistic assessment because dead in the water implies that at least we are floating. When you look at the Congressional Budget Office's own analysis, however, it appears that we may be sinking once again. The Congressional Budget Office projects that our economic growth rate turned negative again in the fourth quarter of 1991.

We note, by looking at this chart that comprises the period from 1989 through 1991, that there was very tepid economic growth in the four quarters prior to the sharp downturn that occurred beginning in the fourth quarter of 1990 and carried over into the first quarter of 1991. Then we saw a very modest attempt at economic recovery, and then in the fourth quarter of 1991 again falling off into negative economic growth.

In its simplest terms, what that means to economists is that this country hangs on the very cusp of a double-dip recession. There is great doubt about whether or not we are going to inch our way out of this economic recession or whether we are going to plunge downward once again into even deeper economic contraction with loss of jobs and attendant human suffering.

It is a devastating pattern of stagnation as we look at this chart, stagnation that continued through almost all of 1990, finally culminating in a very sharp recession, cycling back up to a period of economic stagnation, and then falling off once again into what looks like the beginning of a recession.

This pattern flies in the face of what we have been led to believe and what we have come to learn about post-World War II recessions. Post-World War II recessions have been normally followed by periods of robust recovery and robust economic growth, periods in which employment expanded, economic growth simply exploded in some instances, and the standard of living went up dramatically.

As most economists are now confirming, however, we are now in uncharted economic waters. No one in this country, including the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, is willing to predict with any degree of certainty that monetary policy alone is going to give us even the mild recovery that has been predicted by the Congressional Budget Office.

In the haunting words of the Federal Reserve Board Chairman, Dr. Alan Greenspan:

> There is a deep-seated concern out there which I must say I have not seen in my lifetime.

So says Dr. Alan Greenspan, the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board.

Another thing that Dr. Greenspan has not seen is a recession as long as the current recession. This recession now stands at 18 months and running. This recession is the longest we have seen since the Great Depression of the 1930's.

This chart indicates the duration of post World War II recessions. We have had eight post World War II recessions beginning in 1948 and extending up to the current recession of 1991–92.

All of these recessions have been considerably shorter than the present downturn. If we look at the red bar of the chart, we see the current recession is longer than any recession we have experienced since World War II.

Some have tried to say, well, maybe the recession has been a long one but it has not been as deep as past recessions, it has not been as deep as the recession of 1982–83 and therefore it is not as severe; it has just been shallow but long, of course.

To those who take such a view, I ask them to tell that to the citizens of Hancock County in my State of Tennessee. The schools in Hancock County will close on February 14 because the recession has literally devastated the tax base of that rural county. And tell it to the people of Campbell County, Wilson County, and Cannon County in Tennessee, where the schoolbuses are no longer running and where the schools are approaching a drop-dead date in the very near future because of the devastation to the tax base of those counties as a result of the duration of this recession. Or tell it to the workers of General Motors, the 74,000 who are slated to be laid off. Or tell it to the workers of the IBM company, that once proud flagship of American entrepreneurship which is now laying off thousands of employees. Or tell it to Xerox or tell it to the employees of Du Pont, people who have heard the layoff announcements by the tens of thousands and who are waiting to see if the ax falls on them or on a fellow worker.

It used to be they just laid off the blue-collar workers. That is not happening anymore. The layoffs extend now up through the blue-collar ranks, into the white-collar ranks, up into middle management. And they are not just layoffs anymore. They are permanent job terminations.

If we look at this chart which chronicles the unemployment problems of this country, we see that at the present time the official unemployment rate tells less than half the story. The black bar represents the unemployed, and they stand at almost slightly over 8 million. But look at those who are underemployed, those who are working part time but want to work full time. They cannot work full time because they cannot find full-time jobs in this economy. How about those represented by the blue line who have been looking for work for so long without success that they have become discouraged; they are not looking anymore. They no longer go to the State unemployment offices, so they are no longer carried on the rolls.

When you add all of these, you find that 16.3 million of our fellow countrymen, fully 13 percent of the work force in this country, either cannot find jobs or are reduced to working part-time jobs because they cannot find full-time jobs.

Now, that indicates an increase of almost 4 million people who have suffered severe job dislocation as a result of this recession.

And remember, this comes in the administration of a President who promised to create 30 million new American jobs in 8 years when he took office. I am sorry to say that that has been one of the most hollow promises in recent Presidential history.

I call the attention of my colleagues to this chart. As this chart shows, the anemic job creation that characterized the first 2 years of the Bush Presidency has given way to a net loss of 5,000 jobs. The line running from January of 1989, when George Bush was sworn in as President of this country, follows the 30 million new jobs that he pledged to create over 8 years. We take it out to the end of his term here at 4 years which would represent 15 million jobs. This was the promise.

What has been the reality? This line represents the reality, and as you see it is down here at the very bottom. The reality is that the American economy had a net loss of 5,000 jobs since George Bush took office rather than the 15 million that he promised to create during the first term of his administration.

The job creation pledge is not the only forecast that seems to have gone awry. When the Bush administration took office in 1989, it projected that the economy of this country would grow at an annual rate of 3.3 percent in real terms corrected for inflation. What has been the performance when contrasted with the promise?

The actual average for the 3-year period has been 0.6 percent. Here we have the promise, and here we have the performance down near the bottom of the barrel.

The result is that there is an accumulated gap in economic growth of almost 7 percent, which is the equivalent of roughly $500 billion in unrealized economic growth.

Mr. President, I think this explains why the speech that the President makes this evening simply must serve as a turning point for the President and for the country. I think it is clear to any unbiased observer that we need a short-term economic stimulus to lift us out of this economic stagnation.

But the margin for error is very slight. Any stimulus package that is not well crafted, finely honed, and superbly targeted risks increasing our deficits over the long term, in which case the price of economic growth today will be long-term structural damage to the economy. But I would submit that a temporary well-targeted stimulus that sets the economy in motion will pay long-term dividends, and we will have a chance to again control our budget deficits while the economy is growing, which was not done to disastrous effect in the period of the late 1980's.

And with the economy growing, it means that we can reinvest in our country, can repair a damaged and deteriorated and inadequate infrastructure, and can meet the educational needs of our citizens. And here we are with education being our No. 1 concern. And I look into my State of Tennessee, and I see county school systems closing schools because of an inadequate tax base, all as a result of this economic recession which is devastating.

In the end, Mr. President, I would submit that President Bush's speech tonight will be judged by how precisely it measures the problem that confronts this great country and how carefully it targets the solution.

A grab bag of promises will not do the job this time. A few giveaways just will not measure up this time. Telling all the many interest groups what they want to hear in a State of the Union Message is not going to correct this downturn. That is a nonsolution, a prescription for letting the bad times continue to roll.

Tonight the President of the United States must light a torch. He must lead the American people out of the tunnel, the tunnel of economic stagnation, the tunnel of despair, the tunnel of human suffering, the tunnel that is sapping the very moral strength of this country, just as it zaps its economic vitality.

All Americans this evening will be looking anxiously to the Nation's Capitol. They will be watching anxiously as the President speaks. All of us here in this body will anxiously await his leadership.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BENTSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is recognized.

THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Budget Committee for a very learned presentation, one who has recognized the problems of economy of this country and has been forthcoming with meritorious proposals to help turn this country around.

I appreciate his contribution to it.

Mr. President, when President Bush delivers his State of the Union Address tonight, that is a speech that some have said is going to be the most important speech that he has made in his entire career. I think it may be a unique opportunity for some true bipartisanship. That opportunity is not going to come with soothing words or conciliatory words from an anxious President with his eye on New Hampshire.

The opportunity will exist because many of the proposals likely to be offered by a Republican President are in effect from the Democratic agenda of 1991. And in the competition for ideas the Democrats have had a real advantage in this because we recognized the existence of the recession a year ago. And we came forth with a program to combat it.

The President and his advisers spent most of last year denying that the economy was in serious trouble. And when they finally recognize that we had a recession, then they claimed that it was already over, and that we had nothing to worry about. It was not until unemployment stagnation and plunging polls became undeniable that the administration faced up to the fact of the recession, and said they were going to solve it all in this speech on January 28.

Of course it is impossible this morning to know precisely what the President is going to say tonight. But the carefully orchestrated campaign of leaks which built to a crescendo over the past week gives us some idea of what may be in store. Yet, the frustration is, as late as last night the administration was retracting, changing its program on health care, representing some of the divisions that you see in the Republican Party as to what they think should be done, divisions that a strong President ought to be able to overcome.

There is hope that the President has been listening carefully to some of the Democratic calls for tax fairness, for deficit reduction, economic stimulus, health care reform, education, a trade policy that makes sense for America.

I sincerely hope the President is not going to be satisfied with easy short-term election-year sound-bite answers. There is an element of irony in the fact that the education President—the education President—has 3 years of neglecting educational policy, has come up with more money for Head Start,

possibly the most enduring legacy of the New Frontier.

Mr. President, can anyone imagine that 30 years from now an American President will be visiting a school to pay homage to an educational program put in place by this administration?

I sincerely hope the President's address will be as significant and far reaching as advertised. The country is in trouble. The economy is dead in the water. We do not need another political statement for the campaign.

We need an administration that is ready to face up to these issues, face up to the answers that are so obvious outside the gates of the White House. We need the President to provide some candid answers to some very serious long-term problems.

Let me give you a few examples of what I mean. Anyone who has looked at the state of the American economy will recognize a desperate need for higher rates of savings and investment. We are trying to compete with the Japanese for a rapidly expanding world market.

It is very difficult, perhaps impossible, to succeed in that competition when the rate of savings in Japan is over three times what it is in this country, over twice as much in West Germany as it is in this country; difficult to succeed in that competition with the Japanese with a population two-thirds of ours outinvesting America dollar for dollar by 30 percent.

That is one of the reasons their productivity is so high. Their industrial plants average 10 years of age; ours average 17. They are able to move new products from the research lab to the market faster than we can. We need to increase the rate of savings and investment in America, and one of the best ways to do that is to bring back the IRA for all the workers.

We also need to provide for penalty-free withdrawals for college education expenses, first time home buyers, and major medical bills. I hear the President is going to propose some important changes in the IRA. I hope it is not one that just represents the shift in savings with just the so-called back end IRA, because last year I proposed changes in that IRA that now have 77 Senate cosponsors on both sides of the aisle. Senator ROTH is one of the leading sponsors of it.

Here is an approach on which we can work together, Republicans and Democrats, liberals and conservatives, to increase savings and investments by tapping the over $500 billion of locked up IRA money, 401(k) money, and encouraging millions of American workers to save for the future.

If I read the leaks correctly, the President may also propose some overdue tax relief for middle-income American workers, for the people who are the primary victims of this recession.

I think the President will find some sympathy in the Congress for those proposals. The Democratic leadership in both the House and in the Senate make similar suggestions, and we welcome the President's interest in tax fairness. Working families that have seen their real incomes go down while their taxes went up deserve some of the relief that has been showered on the wealthiest people in our society.

The 34 million Americans with no health insurance, no cushion against medical expenses that can mean financial disaster, are also going to be listening carefully to the President's comments on health care reform. I am afraid they are going to be disappointed in the thin gruel of tax credits.

Certainly, there has been no evidence over the past 3 years that the President is prepared to face up to the complex, costly, and controversial issue of health care. This is an administration that has tried to pigeonhole that issue, put it aside, until after the next election. It is also evident that the American people are not ready to wait another year for progress.

Democrats have heard and they have reacted to that concern. We proposed a variety of answers that range all the way from guaranteed health insurance for every American, to attempts to treat the most severe symptoms of the problem. But it is obvious that we cannot move very far or very fast until we get the White House involved in that dialog, in that debate. And to date, the administration has steadfastly refused to join us in a bipartisan, concerted approach to the heath care concerns of America.

It is also safe to assume that the President will have something to say about trade policy and the importance of opening up foreign markets to American exports. This country has suffered a decade without a trade policy, and we have paid a heavy price for that neglect. We have exported more than 2 million high-paying manufacturing jobs. We have accumulated a trade deficit that is measured in the hundreds of billions of dollars.

Mr. President, I am aware that trade policy is a complex, very important subject, but I also realize that, as in so many complex and important areas, there are basic fundamental truths that apply.

In the area of trade, I believe—and many Democrats agree—that one of those truths can be summarized as follows: We are for free and fair trade, but we must insist that countries selling in our markets must provide us with equal access to their markets. It is that simple and that important.

But for years America has been strangely reluctant to stand up for its rights in trade. Our policy has been to turn the other cheek. We cling to easy talk about open markets and level playing fields. There are occasional sporadic attempts to negotiate in our national interest.

Finally, just a few weeks ago, the President decided to highlight the importance of trade, so he headed up a trade mission to the Far East. I would hate to think that journey will stand as the last word on American trade policy for the nineties. Whether the issue is health care, or incentives for savings and investments, whether the issue is tax fairness, or economic stimulus to help turn our economy out of a recession, whether the issue is education, or policies to increase research and development, America is going to be paying close attention to how the President proposes to pay for those programs.

In my position as chairman of the Finance Committee, I have supported a policy of explaining how I would pay for every policy I have proposed. I believe we should be using a portion of the peace dividend to pay for an economic stimulus package, a new initiative on infrastructure and health and education. I want to break down the so-called firewall between defense and nondefense spending contained in the 1990 budget agreement. Those underlying reasons for erecting that wall no longer exist.

Today, the greatest threat to our future as the most powerful and prosperous Nation in the world is not military, but economic competition, and we must use our resources to make our people and our economy more competitive. However, I also believe we should maintain the basic structure of the agreement in order to preclude any increase in the deficit, because if those spending limits are breached, we could end up with a bidding war on tax relief that could set ourselves back into deficit reduction efforts by a decade.

When he makes his proposals, the President must give us an honest, straightforward idea of how he plans to pay for them. We do not need any creative accounting or economic logic that requires some leap of faith, and we certainly do not need to increase the deficit.

Mr. President, this is clearly an important moment for the American economy. I am pleased we have the President's attention. I look forward to what he has to say to the Nation tonight. I am prepared to work with my colleagues in the Senate and with the administration in the effort to get our country back on the path of growth and opportunity.

The case for change is compelling. There are a series of excellent proposals on the table and, hopefully, the President and his administration are now ready to join with the Congress in building a more secure and a more prosperous future for America.

Mr. President, I see my colleague, the distinguished chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, who played a major role in proposals to try to help turn this economy around. I look forward to hearing his comments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. SARBANES] is recognized.

THE ECONOMY

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, I commend the very able chairman of the Finance Committee, the distinguished Senator from Texas, and the very able chairman of the Budget Committee, the senior Senator from Tennessee, for their very powerful statements here this morning on the floor with respect to the economy. Also I particularly want to acknowledge the very strong leadership which they have shown in trying to address economic issues over the course of 1991, as the Nation moved through the longest recession since the Great Depression.

We are in the longest recession since the 1930's. Now, at 18 months, it exceeds in length any of the post-World War II recessions.

Mr. President, yesterday, the New York Times carried a story with the headline, "President's Message Expected To Lay Out Plans for a 'New Domestic Order.'"

It goes on to quote officials of the administration. One official said, "Everyone agrees that Bush has to lay out a sense of what the next 5 years will be like."

The administrator has talked about this being the most important speech of his Presidency and it comes at a time when the Nation faces an economic situation which we have not confronted for a very long time.

The economy is in serious trouble, perhaps the worst trouble since the Great Depression. The most recent economic indicators paint a grim picture of the current state of the economy. Virtually all of the economic data which we have received over the months of November and December and into the new year indicate the economic decline which started in the summer of 1990, roughly 18 months ago, is continuing and getting worse, making this the longest sustained downturn since the Depression.

Many key economic indicators suggest that this weakness is likely to persist for months into the future.

Mr. President, the index of coincident indicators is an index which includes payrolls, industrial production, personal income, and sales. These are indicators which are perceived as tracking the current pace of economic activity. When one stops and thinks about those, you can see that combined they would give you a good picture of the current pace of economic activity.

This index fell eight-tenths of 1 percent in November. Beginning in December of 1990, there was a very precipitous drop in this index. It leveled off in midsummer. It started down again as we came into the fall period, and then it took a precipitous drop in November. It is now at the least point of any time during this recession, lower even than last March, which many have considered to be heretofore the trough of the recession.

In addition, consumer confidence has plunged 35 percent during the last 6 months. There was a drop in consumer confidence at the early stages of the recession. It came back up again, and now it has dropped once more and is now at a lower level than it was in the 1981–82 recession, which was the most severe recession we had experienced since the Depression.

Retail sales and industrial production fell in December for the third month in a row. Real compensation per hour has fallen by almost 3 percent over the past 3 years.

It is very important to underscore that not only do we have an unemployment problem, but those who are working have found that their compensation adjusted for inflation has fallen over the last 3 years. So those who are working, except people at the very top of the income scale, have found that their standard of living has slipped because their compensation adjusted for inflation has fallen by almost 3 percent over the past 3 years.

The job outlock for 1992 appears to be grim. The number of people filing initial claims for unemployment insurance has risen steadily for the past 6 months and is back to where it was a year ago when the economy was in steep decline.

This chart shows the average weekly initial claims for unemployment insurance. This was the situation at the beginning of 1990. Then last summer, as we moved into recession, the claims for unemployment insurance rose dramatically. Then it dropped—a very welcome development. In other words, the number of people putting in claims weekly decreased and now it has started back up again and is beginning to approach the peak which it had reached earlier in this recession.

In December, the official unemployment rate, which was announced on January 10, rose to 7.1 percent. That is the highest level during this recession. In this recession, we had not gone above 7 percent; we are now at 7.1 percent, the highest level during this recession, and this rate excludes a number of important aspects of unemployment in this country.

My able colleague, Senator SASSER, earlier indicated that the official unemployment rate does not count discouraged workers—workers who have become so discouraged by job prospects that they drop out of the labor force. In December, there were over 1 million discouraged workers, and there were 6.3 million workers who want to work full time but can only find part-time work. They want full-time work. They are looking for full-time work. They need full-time work. But they can only find part-time work. They are counted at one-half in terms of calculating an unemployment rate.

The Bureau of Labor Statistics calculates what they call the comprehensive unemployment rate that includes not only the official rate but also discouraged workers and the people wanting full-time work who are working part time. If you count them all together, the comprehensive rate in the last quarter of 1991 was 10.4 percent. In other words, double-digit unemployment.

In addition, there has been a slow growth of the labor force during this recession. If the labor force had grown as normally expected, the rate would have been almost 1 point higher than it is today; the 10.4 would have been 11.2 percent.

It is estimated that last year 20 million Americans experienced some unemployment during the course of the year. They were not all unemployed at the same time, but they experienced some unemployment during the course of the year. So unemployment has touched literally 1 out of 5 American families.

The number of long-term unemployed, those out of work for 27 weeks or more, rose in December to almost 1.5 million. That is more than double the long-term unemployed at the beginning of the recession.

At the beginning of the recession, we had a little over 600,000 people unemployed 27 weeks or longer. That has now risen to just under 1.5 million.

During the past 3 months, payroll employment in private business fell by 335,000. Private sector employment in December was lower than at any other time during the recession. And, as Senator SASSER indicated in his statement, many of our largest companies are planning massive layoffs in 1992. General Motors announced that last month. It has now set off a bidding war amongst communities and workers in order not to be one of the communities in which a plant is to be closed down.

For months, the administration encouraged the American people to ignore the problems of the American economy. We were given this siren song that the recession is going to be short and shallow; that it would be followed by vigorous renewed economic growth; that we really did not need to do anything. All through 1991, that was the litany.

Beginning back in February 1991, just under a year ago, the President's Chief Economic Adviser, the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, said:

> Our outlook is that the economy, after a relatively brief and mild recession, will rebound by the middle of the year. The recession will be rather shallow and short.

President Bush, on February 12, 1991, in his economic report said:

> The current recession is expected to be mild and brief by historical standards.

Mild and brief by historical standards? The current recession is now the longest in the postwar period. The number of long-term unemployed is now at 1.5 million. The unemployment rate, the comprehensive rate, is at 10.4 percent. The official rate, 6.9 percent for the last quarter of 1991. It was 7.1 percent in the last month of 1991. That 7.1 percent is the highest since this recession.

Then we receive the same litany. In June, Marlin Fitzwater, when we had an unemployment rate of 6.9 percent, said:

> We still believe that the recession is ending and we are on the road to recovery.

In July, Michael Boskin, Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, reacting to the 7-percent unemployment rate in June said:

> We would like to see people have an understanding that this turnabout is coming. We believe the recovery has begun.

These comments continued throughout the summer. Budget Director Darman said:

> The economy is turning up.

In July, he said that "the economy is turning up, the recession has ended, and we are turning up," and on, and on, and on. I regret to say, Mr. President, this continued even into November just 2 months ago.

On the 1st of November, the President said:

> The economy has turned the corner and is headed for a recovery.

On November 13, 1991, the President said:

> I don't believe this country is in a recession.

Finally, late last year, the administration seemed to recognize the seriousness of the economic situation. We must break with this Hoover-like attitude of this administration that prosperity is just around the corner. We must take positive and immediate action to get the economy moving again and end the downward economic spiral that has made this the longest recession in 60 years, second only to the Great Depression itself.

The President said that we would wait for the State of the Union Message for his solutions to our Nation's economic problems. Despite this downward move of the economy over a number of months, the President refrained from coming forward with a proposal. Now the President speaks tonight. I hope he will recognize that real economic problems face the people of this country and they call out for real solutions.

There is a strong national consensus that a change of course is urgently needed. The latest cover of Business Week articulates this consensus. It says: "Wanted: An Economic Policy."

And the editorial accompanying the cover story notes:

> There is a fairly broad consensus that the economy is suffering from neglect and needs fixing. The President and his advisers have been slow to recognize the serious problem we face. And by misstating how bad the economy was, they blocked the developments of proposals which would come to grips with the problem.

The administration would not recognize the problem. How can you have an economic policy, a program, if you say there is "No problem"? That is what we have heard for almost a year from the administration: "No problem."

The people out on the street know there is a problem. The unemployed workers know that there is a problem. The people working part time know that there is a problem.

Mr. President, what remains to be seen is whether the administration not only will recognize the problem, but have a plan adequate to the serious nature of the situation we confront.

I just want very quickly, Mr. President, to set out what I think would be important components of any significant economic policy.

A serious change of economic direction will require a plan which, first, provides enough stimulus to bring the economy out of recession and back to a reasonable rate of growth within a short period of time. We are paying a heavy price for this downturn, including the addition of some $70 billion to the national deficit.

Second, it would end the stagnation of wages and compensation which has plagued the American economy over more than the last decade, so that those who are working find that instead of getting ahead, they are slipping behind.

Third, it should reverse the trend toward growing income and wealth inequality in this country. The Federal Reserve Board recently came with a report which showed a major concentration of income and wealth at the top end of the scale.

Fourth, it should restore the ability of State and local governments to maintain essential services and investments during the recession. State and local governments are cutting back on the very services that the people need: police, fire, and education. They have postponed major infrastructure projects, which are absolutely essential, which would put people to work. The mayors and Governors have assured us that if the Federal Government could provide help to them, they could move these projects immediately—immediately—and have people working within a matter of weeks.

A plan needs to respond adequately to the human suffering caused by involuntary unemployment. It is a shame upon the administration that they forced the unemployed last year to wait from August until Thanksgiving before they extended unemployment benefits. We need to address that problem, and address it right away.

The administration needs to end America's status as the industrialized country with the lowest rate of investment. As Business Week put it in their article, the "U.S. Has an Investment Deficit."

Next, they need to reverse the decade-long assault on public investment, which most economists now concede is a vital partner for expanded private investment. We need both public and private investment to build a strong economy, and the investment in the public sector is integral and essential to the advancement of the private sector. As an executive of a trucking company said to me, if his truck sits for 4 hours in a traffic jam, that is coming straight out of the productivity of that enterprise. If people come out of the schools unable to function because they are functionally illiterate, that is right out of the productivity of the private enterprises that are employing those people. In addition, the administration needs to address the credit crunch and restore the willingness of financial institutions to extend credit for economically viable projects.

As that list indicates, there is an important test of the seriousness of the President's economic policy proposals. Proposals for tax cuts in and of themselves are not a complete economic plan. Changes in tax policy may be part of a viable plan and need to be examined, but, alone, they are not the substitute for an economic plan. We face a range of economic problems. The President needs to recognize the breadth and depth of the challenge, the breadth and depth of the unemployment here at home, and the challenge we are confronting internationally from our trading partners. We need to move the economy out of recession to address the investment deficit, to address the stagnation of wages and compensation for working people, middle-income Americans, to reverse the trend toward growing income inequality, and to allow State and local governments to move forward and restore the investment in our Nation's future.

We are looking to the President tonight not to give us a handful of paliatives—so-called panaceas—but to come in with a comprehensive economic policy that will move the Nation out of recession and restore long-term prosperity to the U.S. economy.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. KENNEDY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY].

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate is transacting morning business at the present time.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator may proceed for 15 minutes. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes.

DEMOCRATS AND EDUCATION

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, when a nation suddenly falls into decline, losing its influence and power, historians probe its policies to determine the cause.

Today, historians are carrying out such analyses on the Soviet Union. But in future years, they may also be exploring the cause of America's decline. How is it, they may ask, that a nation so blessed in its freedoms, so rich in natural resources, so proud of its institutions, suddenly fell into decline? How is it that nations we once sheltered came to overshadow us in vitality and prosperity?

One of the principal causes may well be the failure to devote sufficient attention and resources to the education and training of our citizens. Nations that invest in high-quality education and training will outperform nations that do not make similar investments. The issue is not simply more spending but better spending—focusing our initiatives on efforts that we know will work and can get the job done.

In a recent survey of employers, two-thirds answered negatively when asked about the overall preparation of recent students to hold jobs. That is not surprising, when we consider that roughly 15 percent of the Nation's high school seniors are competent in math according to a recent national analysis. Moreover, in one international study, our 13-year olds ranked last in ability to solve math problems. We cannot expect to compete in tomorrow's global economy when today's students are already far behind those of other nations.

Education is the lifeblood of our national strength. Whenever the Nation has faced new challenges, one of our first responses has been to redouble our educational efforts.

When the Depression persisted in the 1930's, President Franklin Roosevelt established the Civilian Conservation Corps to provide jobs, training, and basic education for unemployed youth, and he established the Federal Government's first student aid program to help college students stay in school. In the late 1950's, President Eisenhower and Congress responded to the launching of Sputnik by enacting the National Defense Education Act, which made new assistance available for college student aid and expanded programs to train math and science teachers.

In the 1960's, wrestling with the threat of communism abroad and the specter of poverty at home, Congress passed landmark legislation establishing ground breaking programs that are still important today: the Vocational Education Act, Head Start, the Job Corps, and the Elementary/Secondary Education and Higher Education Acts with their indispensable assistance to low-income school districts and the vitally important student aid programs, such as Pell grants and Stafford loans.

But today, when the economy is stalled and our education system is under serious challenge, we seem to have lost our will. We talk about the need for a new commitment to education. We have a President who wants to be called the education President. But when the time comes for action, the administration fails to follow through.

If President Bush wants to be the education President, he has to do more than talk about it. He has to take concrete steps to correct the Nation's serious educational deficiencies.

First, he should commit himself to a major additional investment in the proven programs that will help assure that students start school ready to learn. Head Start, WIC, and immunization programs are not just frills—they are the essence of the Nation's investment in young children. A recent study by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching concluded that more than a third of the Nation's 5-year olds are not ready for school when they start kindergarten. Many of those who start school behind will never catch up. And the Nation will pay a heavy long-term cost for its failure to make a modest investment in the early childhood programs that are so important to our youngest citizens.

Second, the President should move to full funding of the Chapter 1 Program, which serves the economically disadvantaged. Every evaluation of this program has pointed to the gains in student achievement that flow from it. Yet the program still serves only half of the Nation's eligible students. Instead of adequate funds, the administration has focused on an effort to turn chapter 1 into a voucher program, so that Federal aid can go to private schools.

Third, the President should support additional investments in college aid—Pell grants, guaranteed student loans, supplemental grants and work study. America is notable for widespread access to higher education. No other nation in the world makes postsecondary opportunities available to so many of its citizens. This commitment is an important engine of economic growth and social progress.

We must make sure that the doors of higher education are not closed because students cannot afford the costs. The Federal student aid programs have helped millions of students, and those who have received the assistance have gone on to make important contributions to the Nation and to our national well-being.

The President should also endorse new initiatives in job training for the large numbers of high school students who move directly into the labor force. Existing programs should be reviewed and revised and expanded to assure that these students—the Nation's frontline work force of the future—will be well-qualified for their careers. Congress is far ahead of the administration in offering solutions to these problems, and this is an area when leadership is especially urgent.

In other areas as well, we need more effective action. The number and quality of school teachers is low. We must increase our commitment to having the best teachers in the world. Again, the administration's proposals in this area fall short of what the Nation needs.

The President should also do more to help combine the social services that children need and make them more accessible. Students cannot succeed academically if they are suffering health, social, or family problems. Yet efforts to consolidate existing programs and make it possible for students to obtain them in one place have suffered because of the lack of leadership.

Finally, the President should make a set of concrete proposals with respect to educational standards and testing. The administration has talked about this complex and controversial issue, but it has not put forward concrete proposals to address it. I have introduced legislation in this area, as has the chairman of the Education Subcommittee, Senator PELL. Democrats in the Senate want to make this happen, but we need the leadership and support of the administration.

The Nation's education needs are immense. But so far, the President has been content with endorsing goals rather than laying out comprehensive proposals for reform. Choice and privatization are not adequate answers to the serious challenge of school reform.

It is easy to predict what the President will recommend in his education budget. Since this is a year divisible by four, the President will propose to boost education spending. All Republican Presidents want to increase the Federal investment in education in election years. Look at the record. President Reagan proposed increases in education spending in 1984 and 1988. But in every other year—when he was not running for reelection—he suggested cuts. President Bush has not proposed cuts in education spending—but he has not proposed significant increases either. But in this election year, the President is likely to rediscover the virtue of a substantial increase.

Consider the President's recent budget proposals for Head Start. That program, which provides education, meals, and health services for preschool children from low-income families, is one of the most successful social programs in the Nation's history. Studies have shown that participants are twice as likely to be employed and 50 percent more likely to have graduated from high school in comparison with nonparticipants. For every dollar spent on Head Start, the country saves al-

most $5 in later social costs. But at present, fewer than 30 percent of eligible children are served by Head Start.

On many occasions, President Bush has paid lipservice to Head Start. For 1992, he proposed a $100 million increase in funding. When we asked why the administration proposed such a small increase, we were told that more money could not be absorbed at the local level. At that rate it would take another 180 years before all eligible children are served.

This year, in an election year, President Bush has decided that the time has come for a substantial increase for Head Start and he has called for $600 million in new funds I welcome the increase, but it is difficult to regard it as more than an election-year handout based on an election-year conversion.

The President has also put forward his version of education reform for the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. We all know that the Nation needs to improve student achievement in all its schools. What the National Commission on Education Excellence noted in 1983 is true today—we are a nation at risk. We ignore the poor performance of our schools at our peril.

But the President's proposal was disappointing. The administration's plan had two basic ideas: using public funds for private schools, and creating 535 new schools handpicked by the Secretary of Education.

The President would have us believe that 535 new schools, public funds to private schools, and an election year infusion for Head Start are the road to education reform. Instead, America needs to undertake a broad-based effort to improve all schools, from preschool through graduate school education.

Our Democratic proposal to improve American education and reach the national education goals has four parts:

First, we must make Head Start available to every eligible 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old child in the Nation. Expanding Head Start is the single most important step the Federal Government can take to improve American education. The value of Head Start is unquestioned and our commitment to it must be steadfast and unwavering. Legislation pending before the Senate, S. 911, will accomplish this purpose, and I hope the Senate will have a chance to take this measure up very soon.

Second, we must provide funds for restructuring elementary and secondary schools. Unlike the President's plan, which targets resources for too few schools, the Democratic proposal seeks to encourage education reform throughout the Nation. Across America, teachers and administrators are trying innovative ideas to bring the spark back to learning—but too often they cannot fully realize their plans because they lack the necessary funds.

Under the Democratic initiative, money will be made available to local public schools to implement their own school improvement programs. To qualify for continued funding, a school will have to demonstrate measurable progress in meeting goals for academic achievement. Some of the funds under the Democratic plan will be available for statewide reform efforts to boost student achievement. The focus of the Democratic plan, however, is threefold: public schools only, school-designed and implemented reforms, and accountability for the results.

Third, we must increase college aid for working and middle-income families. Today, more and more families are feeling the burden of the recession, wondering if they can still afford to send their children to college. Yet last year President Bush proposed to restructure Pell grants so that funds are available only to students with family incomes under $10,000. We must move in the opposite direction. Income ceilings and needs-test restrictions must be reformed so that children of working families are not squeezed out of higher education. The Labor Committee has reported out a bill to reauthorize the Higher Education Act that will extend and expand Federal student loan and grant programs, and the Senate will consider this bill in the coming weeks.

Finally, we must develop new programs to support the transition from school to work and to improve the skills of our work force. The majority of young Americans enter the job market without a college degree. Yet all too often, we treat their entry into the work force as an afterthought, as if our educational responsibilities stopped at the schoolhouse door.

Democrats are committed to providing Federal support to improve school-to-work transition programs for noncollege-bound youth, and to foster ongoing skill development throughout every worker's career. Our proposal calls for:

The establishment of national standards for occupational training;

The creation of career preparation programs that combine academic education and mentored on-the-job training; and

Improved workplace education by requiring employers to invest at least 1 percent of their payroll in worker training.

It is interesting that Germany provides about 3.5 percent of payroll investment, France about 5 percent, other Europeans have comparable requirements. What we are basically talking about is just 1 percent, probably not sufficient but it is a down payment and it is in the correct direction.

Democrats recognize that the Nation faces a fateful choice: Either we make the investment in human capital necessary to compete with other nations by preparing our frontline workers for the new, high-tech workplace, or we consign America to an irreversible future of declining wages.

None of these improvements in education will come cheaply. None will come easily. But in a time of serious economic challenge, no investment we make will be more important for the Nation's future.

We must not hesitate because of the difficult choices before us. Either we mean what we say about education, or we don't. Let the country decide. Let the American people be the judge.

I thank the Chair.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD].

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Chair as to how much time remains for morning business? I believe we are in morning business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business extends until 12 o'clock noon. The Senator was to be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I would ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 12:10.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator is recognized for 30 minutes and morning business will extend until the hour of 12:10 p.m.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I hope to be briefer than that, so we may actually conclude before the hour of 12 noon.

ECONOMIC TURMOIL

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, throughout our history too many from the political community have responded to recessions in the same predictable manner—with misguided optimism, denial, and inaction. Those seem to have been the standards by which previous periods in our history have responded to recessions, at least in their earliest days. Unfortunately, Mr. President, the current recession seems to be no exception in that regard.

For nearly 3 years now our Nation has been in economic turmoil. Since January 1989, job growth has come to a halt in this country. That was 3 years ago, Mr. President—not last week or last month, not even last year, but 3 years ago. Job growth basically came to a halt. Unemployment, as we all know, is now up to 7.1 percent in this country, the highest mark in 5 years. And yet, Mr. President, I know of no one who believes this number is an accurate reflection of the real unemployment in our country. Most believe—and I think correctly so—that the number of unemployed is far higher than the number of 7.1 percent would reflect.

Weekly earnings are down. Housing starts have plummeted. Mr. President, the statistics go on and on that would

indicate how much difficulty our country is in economically.

These conditions, of course, did not appear overnight. They have been visible for years. Structural changes are taking place. Manufacturing jobs have been disappearing at a precipitous rate since the early 1980's. Sadly, and tragically, Mr. President, I believe many of the jobs eliminated over the last 2 years are gone for good.

Mr. President, these fundamental changes demand strong leadership. Our world has changed. That is obvious. We have desperately needed leadership to pull us out of these conditions, and we have desperately needed leadership to prepare us for the challenges of this decade and the next century.

Unfortunately, until last month, on the 17th of December, 1991, almost 3 years from when the recession began, the President refused to recognize the changes happening across our country. Incredible as it is to believe, our President even refused to admit that we were in a recession, until a little more than a month ago.

In my home State of Connecticut, the recession has hit us as hard as—if not harder than—any other State in this country. Mr. President, I have met with people who have lost jobs, seen their businesses fail, and seen their families broken in the last several years. Many rightfully wonder how a nation with so much material wealth could have such poverty and pain. Many wonder how a nation so rich in natural resources could be so short on compassion and human decency.

Mr. President, like many other Members of this body, I have met with dozens and dozens of my constituents over the past number of months to hear firsthand what they and their families are going through. Mr. President, I met with Abe Goldin of Milford, CT, who has not been able to find work as a printer, despite 39 years in the business. At the height of his profession, he was making over $16 per hour. At a field hearing this past fall, he told me, Mr. President, that he would be lucky to find work for half of his former salary, if he could find any work at all.

Pamela Shea is a single mother with two children who lives in Meriden, CT. She was laid off last May by the Connecticut State Police Department. When she came before our committee in September, 4 months later, she told us how she was struggling to make ends meet, and it was almost impossible for her to care for her two children and search for a job at the same time.

Mr. President, I found that no one is safe or immune from this recession. Just this week, I received a haunting letter from a West Hartford resident named Allen Stenhouse. Mr. Stenhouse was a business manager at an insurance agency making close to $50,000 a year. He was laid off 3 years ago and still has not been able to find any work. Within 30 days, he wrote, he will be filing for bankruptcy.

Mr. President, these are three individuals, but they reflect what is going on in thousands and thousands of homes across my State, across my region of the country, and across this great Nation.

These are people who are hard-working Americans, people who have never been without work, people who have acquired skills, people who have acquired professions, people who have provided for their families, people who have been committed and have given to their communities, people who were involved. Yet, these individuals reflect what is going on day after day, hour after hour. Families are, for the first time, finding themselves incapable of providing for the basic needs of their own families.

For these and other Connecticut residents, Mr. President, our Nation's leader has shared just one piece of advice: Wait for the State of the Union Address. Well, expectations are very high today in our Nation's Capitol. Mr. President, people are desperately seeking solutions. They are tired of speeches and rhetoric. They clearly need leadership and, more particularly, they want action.

Hopefully, tonight's speech will offer the catalyst for the President and the Congress to work together, to set our economy back on track. We need to adopt—I think all would agree—solid, long-term solutions for the people, not only of my State but for the people of this great Nation.

Connecticut has been hit early and hard by this recession. In the last year alone, we lost 100,000 jobs in my State. Bankruptcies have gone up 220 percent in the last half of 1991, as compared to the year before. This December, Connecticut entered its 32d consecutive month of job losses, the longest economic downturn since World War II.

Frankly, Mr. President, in certain sections of my State, the unemployment rates are now higher than they were at the height of the Great Depression. Incredible as that is to believe, that is how tragic it has become in certain sections of my State.

The immediate future looks no better. In fact, for the period entering January 18, just a week or so ago, unemployment claims in Connecticut rose by more than 35 percent. The people of my State have not had it easy for the last couple of years, Mr. President. We have been losing high-paying, skilled manufacturing jobs since 1982. We have suffered through a State budget crisis that has left citizens and State lawmakers bitterly divided, to put it mildly.

Lately, the people of Connecticut have been met almost every day with news of another layoff in the defense industry. Just last week, United Technologies Corp. announced it would drop nearly 7,000 Connecticut workers from its payroll over the next couple of years and 14,000 people nationwide.

Some 18,000 employees of the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics are waiting anxiously for this evening's speech and the budget that will come out in the next several days. Their very livelihoods, not to mention the industrial base of the only submarine manufacturer left in this great country of ours, may well be determined by the decisions announced this evening and over the next several days.

Mr. President, I point out that only a decade ago there were six manufacturers of submarine technology in the United States. It says volumes that today we are left with only one in this great country of ours capable of building a critical element for this Nation's national security.

If those people lose their jobs it will not only be an economic blow to my State. I would point out to the President and my colleagues here that if we lose those jobs, far more may be at stake. There are 39 nations, as we speak here this morning, that build or have some 400 submarines prowling the ocean floors this very day. Seventeen nations build submarines in the world today. We have one contractor left, and I suspect we may lose it this year, if the rumors are correct.

The people of Connecticut are no different from anybody around this country, Mr. President. I do not mean to focus just on Connecticut. But my State has felt it hard in these last couple of years, and I know people all across this country from the Midwest, the South, the Far West, are beginning to feel what we have felt over the last several years. They are worried about their jobs. They are worried abut their families. They are worried about their Nation and its future.

An older generation, Mr. President, of course, remembers fear, a generation that went through the Great Depression. I was born after the Great Depression, but I heard my parents and grandparents talk about what it was like to have fear, that fear of not knowing where the next loaf of bread or the next meal would come from.

My father was the first Director of the National Youth Administration in the State of Connecticut. He described to me about how people walked for miles to New Haven, CT, where the job office was, to see if there was not some work they could do to provide for their families.

I only know about that kind of fear because an older generation told me about it, Mr. President. But I think what I am seeing in my constituents' eyes today, what I see in other people's eyes around this country, is the same kind of fear that my parents and my grandparents talked about.

I finally understand, I think, what they were trying to describe to their

children, what it was like to live in the latter part of the 1920's. I finally understood what it was like to feel that no one seemed to care, no one seemed to worry, no one seemed to be able to take action. Of course, a great President told us that the only thing we had to fear was fear itself, and he injected hope in the people of this country, and they began to build and bring themselves out of that misery.

Mr. President, I am seeing that kind of fear today. People fear that their dreams of owning a home, of starting a small business, of learning new job skills, are never going to come true.

They fear, Mr. President, maybe more so than anything else, for their children. It is one thing to fear for yourself and wonder whether or not you will have a job tomorrow, but when you fear for your offspring, wondering whether they will have a chance for a decent future, that more than any other fear, I suspect, is more gripping for a family than is trying to make ends meet. Mr. President, they fear their country is coming undone. They fear the country is fraying.

President Bush did not singlehandedly create this recession. It would be ludicrous to suggest that. What is unfortunate, Mr. President, is the President's repeated failure—repeated failure—to acknowledge the existence of this recession—or depression, as it is in some parts of our Nation.

The failure to even admit that these problems existed, I think, has limited the President's ability, quite frankly, to respond to this situation. And the President's stubborn refusal to look for real solutions has shortchanged the American people.

Of course, this is no time today, as we prepare to listen to the President's State of the Union Address, to just try and point a finger of responsibility. As I said earlier, Mr. President, this is a time to deliver solutions.

The questions we must ask ourselves are: What are those solutions, and how can we get about the business of putting them into action.

We already know, of course, the President's record. The President's priorities have been obvious. The very affluent, and special interests, have always come first, regrettably. For 4 years the President has neglected, as we now know, the concerns of middle-class Americans.

Once again, we hear the Bush administration wants to enact—and they seem exclusively focused on this—a broad-based cut for the capital gains tax. It is almost a mantra. Every time they talk about recovery, it is always the broad-based capital gains tax—a tax, as we all know, that would benefit the most affluent sector of our society.

Mr. President, I happen to believe there may be a role for a targeted capital gains tax in this economic equation we are talking about. But our equation must include far more than just a proposal that will make it possible for the most affluent to enjoy a tax break. Such a cut, a targeted cut, for new investment in small companies, if it were focused properly, I think, would help create jobs and stimulate new economic growth.

And I am pleased to hear the President may also finally embrace the idea of a tax break for middle-income families. Over a year ago, Members of this body pushed to give the middle-income class a tax break. Though the President's provision is late in coming, it is a hopeful sign that we may be able to deliver a tax break for those people this year. Mr. President, it is a good idea, and I hope it will be enacted.

If we want to get this economy moving again, we need to have more than just a quick political fix. We need real solutions that will restore fairness to the top of the economic agenda.

It means that we must do something to aid our cities which have been in steady decline. I should know, Mr. President. Connecticut has 3 of the 10 poorest cities in our Nation.

It means we must do something about trying to bring down the cost of health care while making it accessible to everyone.

It means we must extend unemployment benefits now for as long as they are needed.

It means we must implement economic policies that care about workers and people and not just statistics. The President tells us the drop in the defense budget over the next years will not hurt the overall economy. But he misses the trees for the forest. We need a sound policy to help communities, workers, and businesses to adjust to this massive reshaping of our spending priorities.

It means, Mr. President, we have to move with urgency on children's issues—and I am delighted to hear the President say that he is for the Head Start Program and WIC and child nutrition programs. But, Mr. President, it is a little late in coming.

Many of us here have fought for years to see to it that those programs receive adequate funding. And I would note, Mr. President, the present occupier of the chair, presiding over this body, was an invaluable asset to us as we fought with the limited resources that we had in our overall spending to see to it that children in this country would not end up in last place.

Hopefully, with the President this year finally on our side, we will get some additional resources, and those who are the most helpless in our society will at least be considered in a higher place than they have been over the last number of years.

Now is certainly the time to implement family and medical leave. There is no reason workers in this country should risk losing their jobs to raise a child.

Finally, Mr. President, as Democrats, we have to demonstrate that we can be both profamily and probusiness. To get our economy going, we have to give private industry the incentive it needs, and I respect and support that.

As I already said, I think the targeted capital gains tax cut or investment tax credit or research and development tax credits would reward long-term future investment, not provide a handout to the top 1 percent or so in our economy. We must revitalize the investment tax credit—and do it as soon as possible. We must make the research and development tax credit a permanent fixture of our Tax Code.

Most important of all, we need to work together this year. I know it is an election year—the American public is certainly aware of that—but I think we will do ourselves far more good politically, if you will, if we get about the business of trying to come up with some intelligent solutions to the problems the American public is desperately seeking. That ought to be our goal this year.

If we do that, then I am confident the politics will resolve themselves. And so while the temptation may be to recite just the history and the litany of all the reasons on how we have come to this particular point—and I have identified some of them here this morning, Mr. President—I think the American public is going to be far more interested in what we have to say about what we are going to do tomorrow after the State of the Union Address than how it was that we got ourselves into the situation we are in today.

If the President can escape the special interests that have held him hostage for the last 11 years—and I hope he can—then I welcome his participation in this debate in formulating the solutions that will get us out of this morass.

Mr. President, I have been, like most of my colleagues, to town council meetings and field hearings and meetings with citizens across my State. I have hosted roundtable discussions in all sorts of constituent gatherings. At each and every opportunity, people come up and say, "What is the Congress and the President going to do to get us out of this situation?"

Mr. President, the message is clear: We do not need to conduct polls or conduct surveys to find out whether or not the American public is interested in economic recovery in this country. Any person that has paid any attention whatsoever over the last several years should not have been able to avoid the message people are sending the President and their representatives. They want solutions. They want them soon. They want them to be meaningful.

Mr. President, I look forward this evening to the President's State of the Union Address. I hope it will be a positive, constructive one. I hope the Presi-

dent will do what he did on Inauguration Day, on January 20, 3 years ago, when the leadership of the Congress stood there on the western front of this building and the President of the United States extended a hand and said, "I want to work with the Congress to help come up with answers to our problems."

Unfortunately, that hand was extended that day but withdrawn almost immediately. My hope is he will extend that hand again tonight and say to the leadership in our Congress, let us do what I promised to do 3 years ago and try to come up with some answers for the American public.

That would be a welcome message tonight, and I will stand and applaud my President if, in fact, that is his message tonight.

Mr. President, I look forward in the weeks and months ahead to hopefully, one of the most constructive sessions of any Congress that I have had the privilege to serve in.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

TROOP 10 OF ABERDEEN: A TRIBUTE

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 2, the people of Aberdeen, SD, will celebrate an event that embodies some of the most important values on which this country was founded: brotherhood, patriotism, honesty, community service, tradition, excellence, and appreciation of the environment. Sunday, February 2, will mark the 75th anniversary of Troop 10 of the Boy Scouts of America. Sunday will also be "Boy Scout Sunday."

Virtually everyone is aware of the many important ways Scouting has touched the lives of America's young men and women. In fact, Scouting is so well established in this country that it has become woven into the very fabric of many of our communities. There is perhaps no greater evidence of that fact than the remarkable history of Troop 10 in Aberdeen.

Troop 10 was chartered in 1917. Its sponsor, the First United Methodist Church of Aberdeen, has remained its sponsor since its initiation and has provided the young men of Troop 10 invaluable and faithful support for 75 years. The church is apparently one of only two sponsors in the country who have made such a long-term commitment to a Scouting troop.

In its 75-year history, Troop 10 has seen many of Aberdeen's finest. Many of the troop's former Scouts have continued to support it. One such Scout who deserves special recognition is Joe VanDeRostyne, the young Scout who decided to give back to Troop 10 what his Scout leaders had given him, and is the troop's current Scoutmaster. Through nearly 20 years of direct involvement, Joe has provided the young men of Troop 10 inspirational leadership and friendship.

In addition to Troop 10's wonderful sponsor and dedicated Scoutmaster, there are several other people who deserve special recognition on this important anniversary. Troop 10's assistant leaders and committee people, including Bill Grate, Steve Miller, John Vidoloff, Alan Dixon, Jeff Owens, Todd Saylor, Rich Burroughs, Wayne L. Buss, Earl Kruse, Karen Mogan, Robert Webb, Mark Marion, and Dick Grebner, have provided essential support.

Finally, I want to recognize the current Scouts of Troop 10, who proudly carry on the tradition of this great organization: David Burroughs, Eric Buss, Kevin Jordanger, Brent W. Kruse, David A. Larson, Patrick Marion, Martin E. Miller, Corey Holt, Chris Roeszler, Jason Rudolph, Rob Vidoloff, Jeremy Wein, Alon Wiedenman, John W. Grebner, Nate Dixon, Kevin Franz, Aaron F. Holter, and James A. Berreth.

Mr. President, I am proud of the people who have been involved in the development of Troop 10 throughout its 75-year history, and I honor them all.

THANK YOU, ANN GARRABRANT, FOR YOUR YEARS WITH ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, it is my honor today to pay tribute to a staff member of the Committee on Environment and Public Works who is retiring after 25 years of exemplary Government service.

Ann Garrabrant began working for the committee as a clerical assistant just 2 years after graduating from college. She proved her versatility and competence, gaining promotions to research assistant and professional staff member, her current position, and one that she has carried out with unrivaled expertise for 20 years.

The committee will lose a knowledgeable and precise public servant in Ann. I know my colleagues, committee staff, and agency members who have worked with Ann will feel the loss of this efficient and gracious staff member. Ann has already decided to shift her talent to genealogy research at the Archives, a hobby she has been pursuing. We wish you well, Ann, and heartfelt thanks and gratitude for your efforts in shaping the policy of Environment and Public Works.

TEN PERCENT LUXURY TAX ON BOATS

Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, President Bush will propose the elimination of the 10-percent luxury tax on boats in his fiscal year 1993 budget proposal. I applaud this action. I voted against this disastrous tax when it was enacted in 1990, and I worked throughout 1991 to repeal the tax.

On September 17, 1991, following a Small Business Committee hearing that examined the impact of this tax on boat builders and workers, I introduced a sense-of-the-Senate resolution calling for repeal of the luxury tax on boats. On November 21, 1991, the U.S. Senate approved this resolution overwhelmingly by a vote of 82–14.

It is clear to me that there is tremendous support in the U.S. Senate for repeal of this tax. I will be working closely with the administration and my colleagues in the Senate to ensure that this tax is quickly repealed and that repeal is made retroactive to January 1, 1992. This effective date is vital to stimulating the purchase of boats and preserving thousands of jobs in the boat building industry.

This tax has backfired. It has put thousands of middle-class workers who build boats in the unemployment lines.

An industry that is vitally important to Wisconsin has been singled out for economic destruction. In my State, Carver Boats in Pulaski, Cruisers Inc. in Oconto, Skipperliner in La Crosse, Kracor in Milwaukee, Harken Yacht Co. in Pewaukee, and others are all suffering serious damage from this tax.

Hundreds of workers in my State will soon lose their jobs if this tax is not repealed. Thousands will lose their jobs across America. It is inconceivable to me that Congress is unwilling to help these people and save their jobs.

Some have argued that the job loss in the boating industry is due entirely to the recession. This is clearly wrong. Since last year, when the boat tax went into effect, there has been a 70-percent drop in the sale of boats subject to the luxury tax, those over $100,000. By contrast the sale of boats under $100,000 has declined by 34 percent.

In Wisconsin, the sale of boats subject to the tax is down 80 percent this year, and the sale of those not subject to the tax is down 40 percent.

Obviously, the recession is a major factor. In 1989 and 1990 the recession cost 100,000 marine workers their jobs. But adding the luxury tax on top of this was clearly the last straw. It is literally destroying an industry that was already in desperate straits.

The luxury tax on boats tax is anything but a luxury for the 19,000 middle-class workers who have lost their jobs because of it.

Time is running out. In addition to putting thousands of middle-class workers in the unemployment lines:

The boat tax is forcing plant closures.

It is aiding our foreign competitors by destroying one of America's finest manufacturing industries.

It is costing the Government far more in lost tax revenue and collection costs than it will raise.

This tax must go now. Every month Congress delays, more workers lose their jobs.

Throughout 1991 there was no shortage of evidence concerning the tremen-

dous destruction that this tax has brought to the marine industry. Congress has heard testimony from unemployed boat workers and from boat builders. Businesses have closed, the unemployment lines have grown longer, and still Congress has done nothing.

This inaction is no longer acceptable, Congress must act now.

Another ironic aspect of this tax is that the Federal Government is losing millions of dollars from this tax. A report put out last July by the minority staff of the Joint Economic Committee shows that the Federal Government lost millions from this tax in 1991.

On top of all the suffering and job loss, we have a tax that does not even raise money for the Government.

Last fall, at the Senate Small Business Committee hearing to examine the impact of this tax on small businesses, witnesses from both the manufacturing and retailing sectors testified to the job loss and devastation that this tax is bringing to the marine industry. Particularly compelling was the testimony of Chet Markley, president of local S88 of the International Union of Shipbuilding Workers of America. Mr. Markley is one of the thousands of workers who has lost his job because of this tax. He stated clearly that the members of his union are the victims of this tax, not the wealthy.

Congress must listen to America's boat builders and repeal this tax now. I look forward to working with my colleagues in this effort.

DR. RUTH LITTMAN

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, it is with great sorrow that I speak today to honor Dr. Ruth Littman, who died January 26 at Huntington Hospital in New York. A native of Berlin, Germany, she came to the United States soon after World War II. Through the years she has perfectly embodied the sense of a dedicated citizen.

Dr. Littman had many interests. She composed songs all her life, adapting her creative ability to a foreign tongue, and went on to set up Littman's Music Publishing Co. Among the numerous speciality songs she wrote, two stand out in my mind: "The Safety Song," written to help protect children, and a lullaby, "Pleasant Dreams," written in honor of the birth of President John F. Kennedy's baby son.

Politics was her life and in this she was always solidly supported by her husband of 44 years, Max Littman. Confined to a wheelchair since 1967, Ruth Littman was one American who truly made a difference in the course she set for herself. Party affiliation did not concern her. Ruth chose the issues she was concerned with, and then worked with those who could help get the job done. We shared many of those issues. She achieved outstanding recognition through her work with the prochoice movement, child abuse prevention, senior citizens, the disabled and the homebound, and recently was promoting legislation for health care reforms.

Ruth Littman's grasp of principle earned my confident regard, not a commodity that readily survives rapid change these days. She touched the lives of so many that her death brings sadness to a host of friends across the country. She was greatness with grace—a friend who enriched our lives and leaves us with fond memories which we shall always treasure. We are sorry to lose her formidable knowledge of human experience, her conviction and expectation, her warmth, wit, and wisdom. Her legacy to the many lives she touched should give pride and comfort to all of us.

COMMENDATION OF GEN. CHARLES E. DOMINY

Mr. WARNER. Mr. President, since June 1987, Maj. Gen. Charles E. Dominy has served as the chief of legislative liaison for the U.S. Army. At the end of last year, General Dominy was nominated for his third star, and selected as the director of Army staff. I am pleased to have this opportunity to remark on the fine service he has offered, and continues to offer, the Congress, and the Secretary of the Army.

General Dominy's distinguished career has spanned 29 years, and has included command of the U.S. Army Missouri River Engineering Division, service as the executive officer to the Secretary of the Army, and service as district engineer of the U.S. Army Savannah Engineer District. He is a graduate of the Army War College and holds a master's degree in civil engineering. A combat veteran, he was twice sent to Vietnam, and served there with valor.

As the chief of the Office of Congressional Liaison, General Dominy's mission was to keep the Congress informed by providing complete, timely, and frank information. In this, he succeeded brilliantly, at a time when the need was pressing. Conflicts in Panama and the Persian Gulf, the end of the cold war, overwhelming change in global affairs, and a thorough reevaluation of our Nation's own military posture all necessitated a well-informed Congress. General Dominy was always particularly sensitive to the need of Members and staff for up-to-date, accurate information, a characteristic that has been acknowledged with gratitude by many of my colleagues in both Chambers.

I am particularly pleased to commend General Dominy today because he is a fellow Virginian, born in Arlington and educated in Fairfax County before going on to the U.S. Military Academy at West Point. In fact, despite the transitive lifestyle of the military, he, his wife Mary, and their three children have kept their roots in their native Commonwealth, where the general's father also has his home.

Service and dedication to duty have been the hallmarks of General Dominy's tenure as chief of legislative liaison. The positive nature of the relationship between the Congress and the Army is due in large measure to his stewardship. As General Dominy moves on to a well-deserved promotion to lieutenant general, and new duties, I would like once again to express my sincere appreciation for his outstanding service and support, and to wish him continued success.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

STRENGTHENING EDUCATION FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will resume consideration of S. 2, which the clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2) to provide the achievement of national education goals, to establish a National Council on Education Goals and an Academic Report Card to measure progress on the goals, and to promote literacy in the United States, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

Pending.

(1) Nickles amendment No. 1479, to enhance educational opportunity, increase school attendance, and promote self-sufficiency among welfare recipients.

(2) Kasten amendment No. 1482 (to Amendment No. 1479), to change the effective date to June 1, 1992.

(3) Metzenbaum amendment No. 1483, to discourage States from offering tax incentives that reduce the amount of Federal, State, or local funds available in such State for educational purposes.

(4) Seymour amendment No. 1487, to provide for mandatory parental involvement for students enrolled in choice programs.

(5) Seymour amendment No. 1488, to permit the establishment of SMART Schools as new public schools.

(6) Wirth/Wellstone amendment No. 1490, to express the sense of the Senate concerning investments in education and school-to-work transition initiatives.

(7) Wirth amendment No. 1491 (to Amendment No. 1490), in the nature of a substitute.

(8) Kennedy amendment No. 1492, of a technical nature.

Mr. PELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL].

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this is an auspicious day. The President will deliver this evening his long-awaited State of the Union Address, which we all hope will contain a series of solid

proposals to pull us out of the recession that is taking such a terrible toll on our Nation.

It should be an auspicious day in another respect as well. We have every reason to believe and expect that it be the day that the President offers us the substantive program required to make America first in education. For only if he offers a series of bold, new initiatives can he hope to earn the mantle of "Education President."

If the last several years are any indication, however, it is clear that leadership in education will continue to be associated with the Democratic leadership in Congress, and with its longstanding commitment to improving American education at every level. One need only look at the record to understand that it has been the Democratic Congress, and not the President, that has provided leadership in education. And, one need look only at the pending legislation to understand that it is the Democratic Congress, and not the President, that is willing to undertake the action necessary to bring excellence to every aspect of American education, and to make sure that this Nation becomes the foremost education nation in the world.

I would be remiss, however, if I failed to point out an important caveat. For the most part, education in the Congress has been the product of bipartisan cooperation. We have worked together to solve the serious problems confronting American education. By and large, we have done so without injecting partisanship into the debate. When we have had differences, we have agreed to disagree without letting that disagreement overshadow an overwhelming consensus on the overall legislation. My hope, therefore, is that the spirit of bipartisanship will continue to prevail within the Congress. Excellence in education is most certainly a goal we all share, and one which should not be subjected to a highly charged atmosphere of partisanship.

Since 1987, the Congress has been under Democratic leadership, and during that period it has reauthorized two major pieces of education legislation. In 1988 we rewrote the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and strengthened the Chapter 1 Program of compensatory education for poor children. We provided a new focus upon basic skills for disadvantaged students in both elementary and secondary school. We also required each Chapter 1 school to increase the test scores of its disadvantaged students in order to qualify for additional Federal aid.

In 1990, we enacted a new Vocational Education Act. For the first time that act requires linking basic skills instruction and vocational training. It also stipulates that training be state of the art, and be provided for jobs that actually exist in the community. We also included provisions for performance standards to evaluate the progress of Federal vocational education programs.

We also attempted to enact major parts of the President's education initiative, a much-needed National Literacy Act, and a National Teacher Act to attract talented people into teaching and to upgrade the skills of those already in the classroom. Unfortunately, that legislation was killed by objections from the other side of the aisle in the closing hours of the session.

Last year, we passed the National Literacy Act and reported out of the Labor and Human Resources Committee both S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, and S. 1150, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. We sought to bring the elementary and secondary education bill to the floor late last year, only to be blocked again by objections from the other side of the aisle.

Fortunately, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act is now under consideration on the Senate floor, and I believe most of us are very hopeful that its passage will be imminent. Also, within the near future, we hope to bring the higher education bill to the floor with the hope that it too might be passed early in this session.

In regard to both of those bills, it is important that we understand the basic difference between what the President proposed and what the Democratic Senate has offered. In the area of elementary and secondary education, we have offered an educational reform package that would bring much-needed help to those schools where the need for reform was the greatest. That approach stands in stark contrast to the President's proposal where only 535 schools, or about one-half of 1 percent of the schools in our Nation, would receive help and where there would be no guaranteed focus on sending aid to the schools that need reform most.

Also, we would leave the decision on funding to the States in the belief that they are not only closer but also more knowledgeable about education within their borders than is a national Secretary of Education.

Educational reform is something that must sweep the Nation. If our educational system is to become second to none, it cannot relegate reform to an elite few. If we are to excel in education, we must improve all American schools so that all American students are winners. That is precisely what the Democratic legislation seeks to do.

If we are to keep the doors of educational opportunity open for all Americans, we must have a Higher Education Act that aids both poor and hard-pressed middle income families. That means improved and expanded student aid programs. It means simplifying the application process so that families can understand and complete the necessary forms without difficulty. But, most important, it means increasing Pell grant funding to the point where that program can become an entitlement. These objectives are embodied in the Higher Education Act reauthorization bill now ready for floor consideration, and I remain very hopeful that we will be able to act on that legislation in the very near future.

In education funding, the Democratic Congress has also provided strong leadership. When the President sought to increase education funding by only 2 percent, which was about half the inflation rate, the Democrats sought and achieved education funding increases totaling almost 10 percent. Last year, when the President sought to increase education funding by approximately 3 percent, the Democratic Congress responded with an increase of approximately 18 percent.

It is also important to note that those increases came not in new and untested areas, but in a series of tried and true programs that we know work and work well. I am speaking of programs such as the Chapter 1 Program of compensatory education for poor children, vocational education and training, adult basic education to improve literacy, dropout prevention, education for the disabled, student aid, the TRIO programs, and assistance to improve our Nation's libraries.

There are other important items on the education agenda as well. For instance, if our children are to enter school ready to learn, then surely we must fully fund the Head Start Program. Nothing could be clearer than that. Despite all of the hype, the basic fact is that the President's proposal in this area falls far short. For the future of our children, we have the right to expect more.

If we are to remain leaders in the world economy, we must improve and strengthen the linkage between education and the workplace. This will be a major area of focus this year as we seek to build upon the progress achieved in the last reauthorization of vocational education.

Make no mistake about it, however: Change in this area will not come by drawing a new organizational chart. One does not simply do away with a program that is working well in meeting the objectives for which it was designed. Both vocational and adult education play vitally important roles. New approaches in job training should not come at their expense; they should complement the excellent work they are doing.

If a new priority is to be placed on education in this country—and I believe deeply that should be the case—then it is clear that we must place a new emphasis on educational research and innovation.

The effort to develop national standards in education is most encouraging.

To reach those standards, however, will require hard work. To my mind, some form of testing, even if voluntary, lies at the heart of achieving those standards. This year we will reauthorize the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and it is clear from the outset that this will be one of the major issues to be addressed in that legislation.

Mr. President, I am afraid that the education record of this administration thus far contains far more rhetoric than action. Yet, while the administration has talked about education, we in Congress have done something. We have worked hard to streamline and modernize existing programs, to start new initiatives where they are needed, to be concerned that all of American education must be upgraded if we are to retain a position of world leadership, and to provide sufficient funding so that our education programs can be effective.

Mr. President, we would welcome bold, new education initiatives from the administration, and we would literally be overjoyed to hear a series of such proposals in this evening's address. We reserve, however, the right to offer constructive criticism, to applaud the program when and where it is good, to point out its inadequacies and then seek to overcome them, and to fashion a program that truly seeks to make sure that America has a world class education.

Like our Nation's economy, we have a crisis in American education. It affects every level of education in this country, and reaches into every State and virtually every community in America. It is a crisis that can be solved only by solid programs and a spirit of cooperative action. It cannot be solved by code words, political gimmicks, and proposals that are not up to the dimensions of the crisis.

All partisanship aside, every American wants the President to become the Education President. But we all recognize that cannot be achieved by words alone. One can become the Education President only by word and deed.

We expect the President to offer new programs, but we also have every right to expect that those programs be bold and substantive. We need new ideas, new techniques, and new approaches. And, just as important, we need them at every level and in virtually every schoolroom in the Nation.

We should also expect the President to see and understand that we have some excellent Federal programs already in place. Those programs need only to be strengthened, and in many instances, that strength can come simply from additional funding. Given the plight of the economy, additional funding is not an easy answer. It is difficult, for with the commitment must come the determination to find the necessary funding.

I would stress that more money certainly is not the only answer, but we cannot expect to move ahead without adequate funding of education. Also, if a program is working well and yet reaches only half of the population it is intended to serve, additional funding is absolutely critical.

Finally, I would point out that improving American education cannot be achieved by political gimmicks and code words. It cannot be accomplished by pointing the finger of blame, for I believe we all know that there is plenty of blame to go around for everyone.

This is the time for us to come together, to understand the immensity of the crisis before us and the magnitude of the action that will be required. It also means new programs that strike more than a political chord and actually go to the heart of our problems in education.

If we are to achieve the goals set forth last year by the President and the Governors, we must recognize that each of us has an important role to play, that there may be other goals that are equally important, and that programs to speed education on its way toward meeting all those goals are required at every level.

For our part, in the Senate we stand ready to build upon what we have already done. We stand ready to work with the President just as we sought to do last year. But most of all, we stand ready to help build the kind of educational system that will keep America in the forefront of competition in the world economy. We seek, in short, to make sure that excellence is the byword of American education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERREY). The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL 301

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss one of the United States' most important weapons in addressing unfair foreign trade practices, the Special 301 provisions of the 1988 Trade Act.

BACKGROUND

Special 301 is sometimes confused with two related U.S. trade laws, Section 301 and Super 301. Special 301 is a permanent U.S. trade law addressing foreign piracy of intellectual property, including films, computer software, chemicals, and pharmaceuticals.

Congress created Special 301 with two facts in mind.

First, intellectual property is enormously important to the U.S. economy. At a time when some would question the ability of U.S. industry to compete abroad, American intellectual property is leagues ahead of the competition.

For example, American film and television programs alone generate a $3.5 billion trade surplus each year. American pharmaceuticals generate a $1 billion surplus.

Second, U.S. intellectual property is under attack worldwide. Pirates from Taiwan to the United Arab Emirates to Guatemala are adept in the production of copycat versions of American intellectual property. For instance, often before an American film is released in the United States pirated versions appear on the black market around the world.

The damage to the U.S. economy is stunning. According to the U.S. International Trade Commission, pirating of American intellectual property costs the United States between $43 and $61 billion annually in lost exports. If this piracy were eliminated, the lion's share of the U.S. trade deficit would disappear.

To respond to this piracy, Congress created Special 301.

Special 301 requires USTR to formulate an annual list of countries that allow the most egregious piracy of U.S. intellectual property. Once it has identified "priority foreign countries," Special 301 directs USTR to negotiate agreements to end piracy within 6 to 9 months. If pirate countries refuse to reform, Special 301 authorizes retaliation against the exports of the offending country.

In addition to naming "priority foreign countries," USTR has created "watch lists." Countries that allow some piracy, but not enough to be named a priority country, are placed on a watch list. Placement on a watch list warns countries that future action may take place under Special 301 unless the piracy is stopped.

THE RECORD OF SPECIAL 301

I have not always been pleased with the Bush administration's implementation of Special 301. In 1989 and 1990, for example, the administration established the watch lists, but declined to name any priority foreign countries.

Last year, however, the administration finally began to apply Special 301 as Congress intended. Three countries—China, Thailand, and India—were named as priority foreign countries.

Indeed, in a period of only 3 years, Special 301 has emerged as perhaps the single most effective U.S. trade statute. It has been used to protect film rights in Indonesia, to urge new copyright and patent protections in Mexico, and to start the reform process in Argentina.

Recently, Special 301 negotiations with China were brought to a remarkably successful conclusion. USTR negotiators secured new protections for computer software, sound recordings, agri chemicals and pharmaceuticals. The U.S. intellectual property industries involved have applauded the new agreement.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements from several industry groups, as well as an article recently in the Wall Street Journal, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COPYCAT CRIME: VIDEO PIRATES ABROAD FACE A SWASHBUCKLER WORTHY OF HOLLYWOOD

(By Damon Darlin)

SEOUL, SOUTH KOREA.—The last time Richard O'Neill saw him, Kim Kyoung-In was dashing down a Bucheon alley in his stocking feet fleeing police.

Besides his shoes, Mr. Kim left behind video copying equipment, electronic image enhancers and hundreds of copied tapes of popular American movies. To Mr. O'Neill, the Motion Picture Export Association of America's man in Seoul, these were the smoking guns of a videotape counterfeiter. And Mr. Kim, he believed, was a key figure in the Bucheon Ring of video pirates who were supplying many of Seoul's video-rental shops.

It would be months before Mr. O'Neill was back on the pirate's trail, all the while shocking video-store owners with surprise raids and seizures, and spreading fear through the underground industry by pressing exposed bootleggers into service as informants. He would suffer harsh criticism from Korean video-store associations, harassing phone calls in the night and a cat nailed to his door. "I left it up there," he says. "I don't like cats, anyway."

But Mr. O'Neill, former Green Beret soldier and Vietnam War veteran, is helping the American movie industry make big gains in the war against the Korean underworld of counterfeit tape makers and distributors. When the burly Mr. O'Neill flew into Seoul two years ago, about 85% of the 30,000 video shops in Korea sold pirated tapes. U.S. movie studios complained that pirates were beating them to the stores with movies, stealing a lucrative market.

Adapting guerrilla tactics he says he learned fighting the Viet Cong, Mr. O'Neill has reduced the share of stores selling bootleg tapes to under 30%. "Genghis Khan had a lot of good ideas," he says. The score so far: 734 raids, 140,816 tapes seized or destroyed, 155 convictions, and hundreds of cases pending.

THE COSTS OF COUNTERFEITING

Mr. O'Neill's war is important to American movie makers. The industry reels in about $1 billion in revenue from Asia each year, but loses almost $400 million in potential sales to piracy. (Movies are a leading U.S. export, with overseas revenue of more than $3.5 billion a year.)

Pirating in Asia is no mom-and-pop trade. It is a sophisticated business in which bootleggers copy the latest titles by running 25 or more VCRs at once, and then packing the tapes in what looks like genuine packaging. Some even carry clever counterfeits of the silvery holograms designed to guard against bootlegging.

The legitimate movie industry is happy with Mr. O'Neill's work. "He is a tremendous asset," says Ron Putnam, head of anti-piracy efforts for the Motion Picture Export Association's Asia-Pacific region. Authorized video distributors in Korea report that 1991 sales more than doubled, and several say this year will be even better.

More important, Mr. O'Neill's methods are being taught to anti-piracy officials in other Asian countries, such as Malaysia and Thailand, where more than 85% of stores sell pirated tapes. (In India, all stores are believed to do so.) Makers of computer software, luggage and even machined parts are taking an interest in his anti-pirating techniques, which rely on computers, persistence, long hours and a refusal to be intimidated by pirates or indifferent government officials. "Dick is a unique character and much of his success is due to him personally," Mr. Putnam says. "But his methods can be applied elsewhere."

COUNTERFEITING CAPITAL OF THE WORLD

South Korea has been among the world's worst offenders. Its streets are famous for fake Louis Vuitton bags, rip-off Reebok athletic shoes and bootleg Lotus 1-2-3 software. The copy culture is so deep here that major Korean companies don't hesitate to use Disney-like characters for mascots, appropriate the Batman logo or replicate distinctive packages such as Johnson & Johnson's teardrop-shaped baby shampoo bottle or Procter & Gamble's Tide box.

Korea is changing, but Mr. O'Neill's tough tactics are making Korea change faster. Mr. O'Neill, 5 feet 11 inches tall, weighing more than 250 pounds, and 43 years old, craves whatever action he can find. He grew up in New York City, joined the Army, and gained a commission as an officer. In three years in Vietnam he received a Silver Star and six Bronze Stars, he says. After studying law enforcement at the University of Nebraska in Omaha, he helped set up security for the Seoul Olympics. Hollywood found him in the Philippines doing security work for a U.S. company.

Once in Korea, he set out to get to know his enemy. He and his staff of six Koreans, clipboards in hand, began surveying all 30,000 video shops in Korea. On detailed city maps, they started plotting stores that sell only legal tapes with blue dots and stores with pirate tapes in red. Yellow dots would mark stores that reformed their ways after visits by one of Mr. O'Neill's "market surveyors." (Private detectives are illegal in Korea, hence the euphemistic job description.)

Soon, with prodding by Mr. O'Neill, the police raids began. Mr. O'Neill's strategy: Hit the biggest store in a sea of red dots to scare the rest into compliance. "It's Genghis Khan. You burn one village and leave a few survivors to tell the rest," he says. Nowadays, all he has to do is send a letter asking when it would be convenient to make a raid. He gets photos, via registered mail, from frightened store owners showing them burning piles of counterfeit tapes. "It's the damndest thing. But I got a drawerful of them."

Mr. O'Neill is even so bold as to pose as a buyer and pass out business cards with such names as "I.B. Kuhl," "Dr. Felix deKhatt, Famous Psychiatrist," or "Father Richard of the Friars of St. Valenti," a reference to Jack Valenti, head of the U.S. Motion Picture Association.

Members of the Korean Video & Phonograph Sale Shop Association aren't laughing. In fact, they are angry about Mr. O'Neill and his aggressive style. "We don't know which tapes are pirated," says Jin Suck-Ju, an association director. He admits that shopkeepers sometimes buy from unauthorized dealers in order to get popular titles faster. A bona fide tape sells for about $27. A good pirate version sells for about half that. "The high price the Americans charge is the main cause of piracy," says Shim Yong-Tae, another store owner. "That forces the Korean people to copy. Otherwise we can't make a profit."

RECRUITING INFORMANTS

Most reailers get off with a warning. But with shop owners who could face criminal charges, Mr. O'Neill presses them to turn in other video outlaws. "It works against clandestine organizations," he says. Often, they tell Mr. O'Neill or his quiet right-hand man, Kim Kun-Soo, a former Korean marine, the location of pirate tape inventories. Acting on an informant's tip, Mr. Kim led police to a cache of videos hidden under sacks of rice in a store across the street from a Seoul video shop. Sometimes informants lead Mr. O'Neill to distributors. Some even become agents, infiltrating the pirate distribution chain.

One informant told Mr. O'Neill about a meeting of outlaw manufacturers who were gathering to discuss what to do about the new American in town harassing them. Mr. O'Neill got one of his men to pose as a parking-lot attendant. He took down license numbers that led to the identities of many major bootleggers.

With his reputation well established, some tips now come walking through his door. A pirate's estranged wife informed on her husband last year because he wasn't providing her enough money. "Can't you do anything to get him?" she asked. Mr. O'Neill was happy to oblige her.

Mr. O'Neill's quarry is still a slippery prey. He spent days in a cheap hotel, listening and monitoring power meters, to find the room where a pirate was operating. When he finally made his move, bursting through the door with police, all they found were two stunned lovers in a clinch. The suspect had moved across the hall.

It was luck that put him on the trail of Mr. Kim, the shoeless pirate. A rival distributor, angry that Mr. Kim had invaded his turf, led Mr. O'Neill and police right to the shop in Bucheon. But the raid was a bust when Mr. Kim and his associates saw police and fled.

MAN'S BEST FRIEND?

Mr. Kim left his dog, a light-brown mutt that the informant said Mr. Kim adored. Mr. O'Neill kept the dog for weeks, hoping Mr. Kim would call to make a deal. He didn't, so the investigation continued.

On a computer in his office above a Shakey's Pizza parlor, Mr. O'Neill drew links between shops, distributors and manufacturers in what he calls an "intel-association matrix." In the list of 120 suspected manufacturers and distributors, Mr. Kim's name was still being linked to seven men known as the Bucheon Ring, named for the industrial city west of Seoul where they operated. Also, printed tape boxes, each baring almost imperceptible manufacturing marks typical of Mr. Kim's operations, were popping up at various stores, suggesting he was still in business. But where?

Then, last fall, informants found Mr. Kim, the alleged pirate, operating in a house in northeast Seoul. When police swooped in, they confiscated 34 VCRs, 6,000 tape boxes, 1,320 blank tapes, plastic shrink-wrapping machines, and 540 copies of "The Star Wars: Empire Strikes Back," among other titles, including "Terminator 2," which hadn't been released here on video. They also caught Mr. Kim.

Mr. O'Neill says within six months he will have the share of Korean stores selling pirate tapes below 20%. (in the U.S. and Japan the rate is 12%.) But already pirates are finding new outlets for their ware: Video theaters showing movies copyrighted before 1987, and thus unprotected under Korean law. Others are wiring Korean homes to rogue cable systems.

The movie studios now have Mr. O'Neill traveling to Thailand, where pirate tapes are

sold openly on streets to tourists (though the videos won't play on American TV sets). He recently raided a shop in Bangkok that carried 44,000 bootleg tapes. "We've never seen anything of that scale in Seoul," he says. "It is real cowboy and Indian country down there."

CHINA AND UNITED STATES CONCLUDE NEGOTIATIONS LEADING TO NEW CHINESE PRODUCT PATENT PROTECTION

WASHINGTON, DC.—The following statement was released by PMA President Gerald J. Mossinghoff in response to the new Chinese product patent protection agreement reached in final negotiations between U.S. and Chinese officials:

America's research-based pharmaceutical companies are pleased that Chinese and U.S. government negotiators have struck an important agreement that will lead to early pharmaceutical product patent protection in the People's Republic of China. This breakthrough opens the door to increased U.S. pharmaceutical sales to a very important market.

The intense intellectual property protection negotiations between Chinese government officials and officials from the office of U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills have concluded successfully. Both sides are to be praised for their diplomacy and sense of responsibility.

The People's Republic of China has agreed to: provide 20-year product patent protection; provide pipeline protection for pharmaceutical products invented as early as 1984 and provide a substantial period of market exclusivity for such products, and pass and implement product patent protection by January 1, 1993.

The steps outlined in the agreement are a major contribution to intellectual property rights protection in the world's largest country. The agreement marks a major step forward to a position of leadership for China in intellectual property rights protection in the developing world.

This agreement will mean a greatly enhanced trade relationship in the pharmaceutical sector between our two countries and improved health prospects for the Chinese people.

The agreement between U.S. and Chinese negotiators demonstrates that important developing countries—such as China—are fully capable of enacting patent protection for pharmaceutical and chemical products immediately. Indeed, the Chinese government has demonstrated a willingness to correct the inequities in its intellectual property relationships with the United States.

The promise of this agreement can only be realized by faithful implementation, as well as by the continuation of a growing commercial relationship between the United States and China. The PMA, because of this breakthrough, supports further development of the U.S. relationship with China, including support for Most Favored Nation (MFN) status for China.

We can only offer our appreciation and thanks to Ambassador Hills and her colleagues. Once again, they have demonstrated their ability to respond decisively and successfully in the continuing fight against international patent piracy. This fight is one for U.S. exports and U.S. jobs in the high technology American research-based pharmaceutical industry.

IIPA APPLAUDS SETTLEMENT OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DISPUTE WITH THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

WASHINGTON.—The International Intellectual Property Alliance (IIPA) today applauded the U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills' announcement that the United States has entered into an agreement with the People's Republic of China [PRC] which will extend full copyright protection to U.S. and other foreign copyrights at internationally acceptable levels. U.S. Ambassador Hills had previously announced that trade sanctions would be imposed if the PRC were unwilling to provide full protection for U.S. intellectual property.

Under the Memorandum of Understanding [MOU] signed between the U.S. and the PRC, the Chinese government has committed to raise further the level of protection afforded under its current copyright law (adopted in 1990) and extend the protection of that law to foreign works. Until this agreement, the PRC protected only works of Chinese nationals or works first published in the PRC, and had refused to provide, for example, copyright protection to U.S. computer software as a literary work as required by the Berne Convention.

In the MOU, the PRC agrees to extend protection to all foreign works by joining the Berne Convention effective October 15, 1992 (which will protect U.S. books, movies, music and software), the Geneva Phonograms Convention, effective June 1, 1993 (which will protect U.S. sound recordings), and to protect all these U.S. copyrighted works even before adhering to these Conventions effective 60 days after the signing of this agreement. Another critical feature of this agreement is that it will extend protection to all U.S. copyrighted works created prior to the date the bilateral is signed so long as those works remain protected in the U.S.

The agreement also commits the Chinese government to provide effective enforcement to reduce and eventually eliminate the severe losses now suffered by U.S. industry through piracy in the PRC.

Commenting on this historic agreement, Eric Smith, General Counsel of the IIPA, said "We commend Ambassador Hills and the Administration for insisting that the PRC bring its copyright protection up to an acceptable level. The copyright industries have suffered severe and growing losses due to piracy over the years while we patiently awaited China's decision to protect our intellectual property. We hope we will begin to see these losses diminish.

"This Agreement has been long awaited," he added, "and demonstrates that the Chinese government is now committed to implement internationally-accepted high standards of copyright protection. The IIPA applauds China for showing real statesmanship in agreeing to adopt Berne Convention levels of protection and to enforce the new regulations which will be adopted implementing this agreement. In recognition of this statesmanship and the PRC's commitment to protect U.S. copyrights, IIPA is prepared to speak favorably before the U.S. Congress on the issue of according MFN status to the PRC."

On implementation, Smith commented, "Any benefits we see, of course, will depend on China's good faith implementation of the agreement and on enforcement. We fully expect scrupulous and vigorous compliance with the commitments made in this MOU."

The IIPA, formed in 1984, is composed of eight trade associations, each of which, in turn, represents a significant segment of the copyright industry in the United States. Those associations are: American Film Marketing Association (AFMA); Association of American Publishers (AAP); Business Software Alliance (BSA); Computer and Business Equipment Manufacturers Association (CBEMA); Information Technology Association of America (ITAA); Motion Picture Association of America (MPAA); National Music Publishers' Association (NMPA) and Recording Industry Association of America (RIAA).

The IIPA represents more than 1,500 companies which produce and distribute computers and computer software; motion pictures, television programs and home videocassettes; music, records, compact discs, and audiocassettes; textbooks, tradebooks, reference and professional publications and journals. These core copyright industries accounted in 1989 for over $173 billion in revenues from their copyright-related activities, or 3.3% of the U.S. GNP. According to a report prepared for the IIPA by Economists, Inc. entitled "The Copyright Industries in the U.S. Economy," these industries grew at more than twice the rate of the economy as a whole between 1977 and 1989 (6.9% vs. 2.9%), and employed new workers at a greater rate—5% between 1977–1989—than any other comparable sized sector of the U.S. economy. These industries delivered over $22 billion in export earnings to this country in 1989.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, our experience with Special 301 carries several important lessons. First, negotiations work best when the United States sets priorities and deadlines. Special 301 requires USTR to target the worst violators of U.S. rights and puts time limits on the negotiations.

The deadlines force decisions both here and abroad. Recently, Special 301's deadline gave USTR negotiators the leverage to keep China from dragging on talks forever.

Second, the United States must be willing to stand up for its trading rights; again the China talks are instructive. The Chinese knew that if they did not commit to reform, the United States would implement proportional retaliation against Chinese exports to the United States. The credible threat of retaliation convinced China's leaders that they must reform their intellectual property laws.

Special 301 action against China demonstrates an additional lesson about the effectiveness of tailored trade tools. As I have argued for some time, we have a better chance of reforming Chinese behavior if we use policy tools specifically tailored to the problem we seek to address, instead of simply threatening to cut off all trade by revoking MFN treatment.

NEW SPECIAL 301 DECISIONS

This spring, USTR must again make a determination as to U.S. priorities in the continuing battle to protect intellectual property rights, and many problems remain.

Taiwan, Thailand, India, and Poland are cited for piracy by almost every sector of the intellectual property industry. Additionally, the motion picture industry faces blatant piracy in Guatemala and Greece. Illegal copying of American computer software continues in Germany, Italy, and Korea.

United States sound recordings are pirated in Paraguay and the United

Arab Emirates. U.S. pharmaceutical manufacturers lose hundreds of millions of dollars to knock off producers in India, Brazil, and Argentina.

The administration should look carefully at these and other cases as it considers priorities for 1992.

CONCLUSION

Many were hopeful that multilateral action in the Uruguay round would decrease the importance of United States laws such as Special 301. Unfortunately, new GATT protections on intellectual property appear modest. Negotiators may well fail even to conclude the round.

Creating comprehensive rules governing intellectual property protection worldwide is an important goal. Perhaps one day an effective international regime will make Special 301 unnecessary.

In the meantime, USTR must continue its willingness to use unilateral pressure to stand up for U.S. rights.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Tennessee is recognized.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. GORE pertaining to the submission of Senate Concurrent Resolution 86 are located in today's RECORD under "Submission of Concurrent and Senate Resolutions.")

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. GORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, is the Senate scheduled to recess at 12:30?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. DOLE. I wonder if I might ask unanimous consent that that be delayed until 12:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

SENATOR COATS—MIDDLE-CLASS TAX RELIEF

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, during the past few weeks we have heard much about the economy—much about proposals aimed at helping the economy, especially helping the middle-class—and much about the state of the Union.

The President is sure to announce a relief measure designed to help the economy and the middle-class.

But I think that there is one Senator who deserves great credit in reminding us about the struggles that families face.

From his days in the House of Representatives, my good friend and colleague from Indiana, Senator COATS, has been a primary force behind tax relief for the American family.

As I review the record, in this past year alone, Senator COATS led the way with five tax proposals advocating assistance for lower- and middle-income families.

As early as January 14, 1991, Senator COATS introduced legislation which would double the personal exemption.

He later introduced legislation aimed at helping families by increasing and doubling the personal exemption for dependents.

No doubt about it, DAN COATS has helped pioneer the middle-class tax relief movement. In 1991, Senator COATS authored not one but four bills before we heard from any other Senator. The record shows that the American middle-class—American families—have a great friend in Senator COATS.

Senator COATS has already kicked off the tax relief debate, and you can be sure he will be there to push the ball toward the goal line.

It is a real tribute to Senator COATS that some of his ideas will not only be reflected in the game plan President Bush unveils tonight, but also in the plans of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

UNFAIR AND UNAMERICAN

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in this country, in our political system, pretty much any criticism or questioning of a politician is considered fair game. We all get into this business with our eyes open, and we know that public scrutiny, and even unfair allegations, are part of the game.

But even in this business, there are limits. And when criticism goes beyond being unfair, goes beyond being even utterly groundless, and becomes just out-and-out vicious—then it is time to blow the whistle.

One of the most difficult, emotional issues facing this country is the fate of our POW/MIA's. It is an issue which has dragged on far too long, one which must be dealt with urgently. That is exactly why we have established our select committee, under the leadership of Senator KERRY and Senator SMITH.

Certainly, the families and friends of those who are MIA's endure an emotional torment that the rest of us can never imagine. If those emotions sometimes spill-over into frustration or anger, that is something we all understand.

But no one—no matter what their cause or frustration—has the right to issue scurrilous, utterly unfounded attacks on the fundamental character of anyone else.

I have in my hand a flyer that—under the guise of making some points about the POW/MIA issue—contains utterly groundless, mean-spirited, vicious assaults on the character of a U.S. Senator, a U.S. Senator who, more than anyone serving in this body, ought to be immune from questions, or allegations about, his patriotism and commitment to resolving the POW/MIA issue.

The people who put out this kind of trash ought to be ashamed of themselves. The many, many Americans who care deeply about the POW/MIA issue, who are actively and properly involved in demanding that it be resolved immediately—they ought to be outraged that their cause is being misused and distorted by the angry, extremist fringe putting out this garbage. And all Americans who believe in fairness ought to condemn these kinds of dirty tricks as unfair and un-American.

I yield the floor.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUNN). The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

THE POW/MIA ISSUE

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Senate Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs, working with Senator SMITH, with whom I have forged a strong work relationship and friendship, I think both of us have been struck by the ferocity and the low-level attack which the minority leader has just referred to.

Both Senator SMITH, I and, in fact, the entire committee have taken pains to pledge and to follow up on that pledge to treat with respect anybody who has any claim to have information or expertise regarding the POW-MIA. And in virtually every case, both public and nonpublic persons and organizations have responded by dealing with our committee frankly and cooperatively and in a mutual effort of trust and in an effort to find the truth.

Sadly, Mr. President, there is now one exception. Yesterday, I saw for the first time a newsletter entitled U.S. Veteran News and Report, dated January 23, published in Kinston, NC. The author is an individual who testified before our committee, and he claims to care about the American servicemen still listed as missing in action from that war.

Frankly, whether that is true or not, I do not know, and I wonder. But what I do know is that he appears to be an individual of such a warped judgment

and of such an attitudinal indifference to reality that it is hard to believe that he is either a friend of the truth or a friend of our POW-MIA's and their families. The newsletter consists of a vicious and wholly unsubstantiated and unseemly personal attack on a member of our committee, whose patriotism and whose service to this country is absolutely beyond question or dispute, a member who has probably given more to this country than any other who serves on the committee or than any other in the U.S. Senate, and whose personal integrity and whose character are well known.

The newsletter is not a statement of political disagreement, Mr. President. It contains no serious analysis of the facts or the issues. It is simply a scurrilous effort to trash the reputation of a U.S. Senator and to feed the atmosphere of suspicion and conspiracy that already clouds this complicated issue.

Ordinarily, I do not believe it would be necessary to respond to allegations that are as palpably ridiculous as those contained in this newsletter. Unfortunately, there is a lesson to be learned in recent years, which is that lies, no matter how pathetic they are, should simply not go unchallenged. So it is my hope today—and I know my colleagues join me in saying this—that these lies will be plowed under the ground and forgotten like the garbage that they are.

Mr. SMITH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

SUPPORTING SENATOR McCAIN

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I thank my colleagues and the chairman of the committee for his remarks, and I thank Senator DOLE for his remarks in support of one of my colleagues, Senator JOHN MCCAIN.

All of us who worked this issue, and certainly those of us on the select committee, realize how emotional, intense, and frustrating this issue is. Under the leadership of Senator KERRY and other members of the committee, we have been able to put together a wide investigation. It is covering all aspects of this issue, most recently the Soviet connection. And to see these kinds of remarks appearing in a public form, a public letter about one of our colleagues is just so aggravating and uncalled for, that even though I hate to give it any credence by responding to it on the floor of the Senate, I feel I must do that.

This is a personal attack, an outrageous personal attack, on the integrity of JOHN MCCAIN. It is a personal attack on his character, and even more important and worse, an attack on his patriotism. This is a man who was a prisoner of war for a number of years and was tortured by the North Vietnamese. It is uncalled for; it is disgusting, and I cannot indicate strongly enough how I feel.

I know I speak for the other members of the committee who are not here. JOHN MCCAIN has a more personal stake in this matter, perhaps, than any of us on the committee or in this body right now, in the sense that, as a prisoner of war who came home, he would like to see this issue resolved. He has worked together with us to do that.

It is certainly not helpful, in finding the truth, to have to put up with these kinds of attacks on one individual who is committed to doing that. It has no useful purpose. Mr. President, no useful purpose whatsoever. I just want to say for the public record that I have written Senator MCCAIN a personal letter indicating my outrage, and I hope that at some point in time the individual will see fit to apologize and move on to the more important task of getting the answers that we all want and are looking for in this committee, and stop this kind of scurrilous personal vendetta against people for absolutely no reason.

I just want Senator MCCAIN to know, speaking for myself and I know for other members of the committee, that we stand with you my colleague, in this very difficult time for you, and we intend to do everything we can to set the record straight in the future with any remarks that we have to make. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. BROWN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KERRY). The Senator from Colorado.

SUPPORT FOR SENATOR McCAIN

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I rise out of concern over the attack on Senator MCCAIN. I suppose one of the most rewarding tasks that I have found in the Senate has been the opportunity to serve on the select committee that is investigating the Vietnam POW/MIA issue.

It is rewarding because it has done a job that needed to be done, with integrity; it is rewarding because the select committee has been willing to look into all areas no matter how sensitive. While the committee has not finished its task, I believe before it is finished, it will have gained a reputation for integrity and for a willingness to consider all the facts. What it will do in the long run is much more important: It will set the record straight.

This Nation owes an enormous debt of gratitude to those who served their Nation in a cause that was not very popular at home. All of us know that. We also must find out if any Americans were left behind. Not simply for those Americans' sake, but for the sake of this country, a country that has established a reputation of never turning its back on those who served it.

To not respond to the vicious attack on Senator MCCAIN would be turning our back on one who served this Nation. Perhaps no family in the history of our Nation has as distinguished a record of military service as the McCains. Perhaps the MacArthur family would provide competition, but it would be close contest.

JOHN MCCAIN carried on his family's great tradition of service to our Nation. JOHN MCCAIN was captured as an American serviceman and served 5½ years of hell in Hanoi. He was a POW at a time when his father was a four-star admiral in charge of a Pacific fleet. The enemy knew and understood the importance of his family and tortured JOHN MCCAIN in a way that far surpasses the suffering of most Americans. I doubt if very many people who have been active on the POW issue could ever compare their suffering experiences to his.

JOHN suffered that hell, and served this country with exceptional distinction. He came home with a list of medals that would make any American proud, including the Silver Star, and the Distinguished Flying Cross. To be smeared by people who ought to be grateful for his exceptional service is simply wrong.

This Nation and this Chamber would be remiss if we did not speak out about the kind of smear that has been perpetrated against JOHN MCCAIN. JOHN'S record does not need any defense. JOHN has one of the most distinguished records of any person who has ever served this Nation.

But what does need defense is this country. We need defense against people who would abuse the freedom of speech to smear someone they ought to honor. And we would be remiss if we did not let our voices ring out in identifying the smear for what it is.

We also ought to take advantage of this opportunity, I think, to again express thanks to Senator MCCAIN for his willingness to serve, for his valiant efforts to fight for the cause of freedom, and for his personal integrity that sets an example for all of us.

I hope I personally can play some small part in bringing the facts to light with regard to POW's, and I hope perhaps my effort will be of some value in that area.

But must set the record straight when this kind of misrepresentation takes place. I am deeply grateful that this Nation has enjoyed the service of JOHN MCCAIN, and I hope when the people who perpetrated this smear calm down and have a chance to reflect on their own actions, they will not only apologize but they will seek to set the record straight.

I yield back the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. NUNN addressed Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt anyone who wants to

speak on this particular subject, which I know is very important to get the record straight on this, but assuming those comments are over I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak therein, and that I be recognized for up to 15 minutes, and Senator METZENBAUM for up to 10 minutes, and at the conclusion of Senator METZENBAUM'S remarks the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Hearing none, it is so ordered.

Mr. NUNN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

THE CONTRIBUTION OF OUR MEN AND WOMEN IN UNIFORM IN WINNING THE COLD WAR

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, as we begin the debate this year on the size and shape of our military forces for the future, I think it is appropriate to pause and recognize the vital role that our men and women in uniform and their families have played in bringing about the successful conclusion of the cold war.

Debates on defense usually focus on weapons systems. There is a certain glamour associated with airplanes that can fly at supersonic speeds and deliver devastating munitions with precision. There is a certain glamour in tanks that can roar across vast, rugged expanses and deliver crushing firepower with pinpoint accuracy. There is a certain glamour in submarines that can operate underwater for months at a time and attack undetected. There is a certain glamour to systems in development that can shoot down missiles from space. And indeed, there is a certain glamour in hand-held, smart weapons that can track down and destroy moving targets in the air and on the ground. We saw many of these weapons in action on live television coverage of the Persian Gulf conflict. The results demonstrated to the world the outstanding technological achievements of the American defense industry and the men and women in the defense industry.

Yet, none of our weapons would have been effective without the highly professional, well-trained, dedicated men and women in uniform who have endured the sacrifices of military service with their families over the past 40 years—in peacetime and in wartime.

Mr. President, from the end of World War II until today, over 23,000,000 Americans have served in our Armed Forces. Of this number, 16,600,000 served during major conflicts—5,700,000 during the Korean conflict; 8,744,000 during the Vietnam conflict; and 2,160,000 during the Persian Gulf conflict. A total of 112,688 Americans made the ultimate sacrifice for their country in these three conflicts, and more than twice that number were wounded:

In the Korean conflict, 54,260 American soldiers lost their lives, and 103,284 were wounded.

In the Vietnam conflict, 58,135 American soldiers lost their lives, and 153,303 were wounded.

And most recently in the Persian Gulf conflict, 293 Americans lost their lives, and 467 were wounded.

In addition to these major conflicts, Mr. President, American military men and women have been called on to carry out other military operations in varying size and intensity all over the world, most recently in Operation Just Cause in Panama. In just the last 12 years, 502 military members have been killed in these operations and in mindless terrorist bombings and hostage situations. For example, 268 military members were killed in Lebanon during peacekeeping operations in 1982–84. Scores more were killed in operations in the Dominican Republic, Grenada, and Panama. Military personnel lost their lives in El Salvador and Guatemala; in the Sudan and the Sinai; in both Germanies; and along the Korean DMZ long after the Korean war armistice.

Along with these deaths from hostile actions large and small, 15,158 military members have died in unavoidable accidents of military life and training since 1979, reminding us that even in the best times military service is a dangerous profession.

Mr. President, each and every one of these losses added to the price our Nation paid to win the cold war.

In the decades since World War II, we have called on our men and women in uniform to keep the peace, and to fight when necessary to preserve our national security interests. We have called on our men and women in uniform to maintain a formidable forward presence to deter war in Europe and in Asia. We have called on our men and women in uniform to maintain a high degree of combat readiness through rigorous training on land, at sea, and in the air. We have called on our men and women in uniform to stand alert at remote and isolated radar stations, missile silos, ground outposts, and on lengthy deployments at sea. And we have called on the families of military members to bear unique burdens: long periods of family separation; frequent moves around the country and the world, often to isolated military installations; and—in time of conflict—the numbing anxiety over the fate of their loved one.

The successful conclusion of the cold war is a tribute to the skill, the dedication, and the patriotism of every single individual who responded so magnificently to these calls from their Nation.

Mr. President, in addition to carrying out their responsibilities as warriors, military men and women have served as ambassadors of good will in countless humanitarian missions around the world. They have unselfishly transported medical and food supplies, provided medical aid, evacuated victims of natural disasters, restored needed communications, and repaired roads and bridges as well as many other tasks.

These humanitarian efforts by our military members carried the American ideals of freedom and democracy and humanitarian concerns throughout the globe. America demonstrated to our adversaries that we had the strength, resources, and resolve to defend our interests and our allies militarily; but we also showed the world that we had the compassion to help friends and adversaries alike when natural catastrophes imperiled human lives. And we are doing that again in our former adversarial country, the former Soviet Union and the Republics, and the people there who need assistance with food and medicine.

In recent times, American service men and women rushed assistance to earthquake victims in Armenia in 1988; assisted hundreds of thousands of Kurds in Northern Iraq in 1991; helped provide emergency assistance to almost 2 million people affected by flooding in Bangladesh last year; and restored order in our own Virgin Islands after Hurricane Hugo in 1989. Today, military members are providing assistance to thousands of Haitian refugees at the Guantanamo Bay Naval Base in Cuba whom they helped rescue from unseaworthy vessels, and are airlifting food and medical supplies to the needy citizens of the newly independent republics of the Commonwealth of Independent States.

Mr. President, the cold war is over, but the Nation still relies on our men and women in uniform to keep the peace as our former adversaries struggle to overcome years of economic and political decay to join the free world community. They must do so in an uncertain environment as our military forces become smaller as they will and must. Our challenge will be to ensure that we maintain sufficient strength and resolve over the next 10 years and in the years thereafter to guarantee the victory of our men and women in uniform that they sacrificed to win, and that this victory will result in peace and democracy in the world. Our military services will be smaller in the future, but they will still require well-trained, well-equipped, highly motivated men and women to be fully combat ready.

At the same time, we must take care of—and this year we are going to be discussing this quite a bit because it is very important—we must take care of the 300,000 or more people who will be leaving military service each year over the next few years as we reduce the size of the Defense Establishment.

All of us were, of course, disturbed when we read about the layoffs at General Motors and in other industries throughout our country. But none of these layoffs will be nearly as significant in terms of the numbers of people as the numbers of people who will be getting out of military service not just this year but in the next several years.

These people helped win the cold war as well as the hot war in Operation Desert Storm, and they deserve to return to secure jobs and homes in our towns and cities. This will require resources which we must continue to provide.

In a series of speeches over the next several days, I intend to address these challenges—supporting our men and women in uniform during the defense build down; minimizing the effect of the defense transition on our men and women in uniform; and capitalizing on our investment in our men and women in uniform as they leave military service, because we will have the largest number of well-trained highly motivated, well-qualified, and well-educated people getting out of our military today than we have had in many, many years, and they will be able to play if we give them a hand—not a handout, but a hand—in terms of getting employment, and let the people out there in the private sector and in the public sector know about their talents. They will be able to contribute immensely to the productivity and the economic future of our Nation.

Mr. President, as the cold war recedes in history and we turn our attention to the challenges of the future, we should all pause to acknowledge the tremendous debt we owe to those who have served in our military services and who continue to serve. I salute them and their families, and I pledge to them that their contributions and sacrifices will not be forgotten as we go about our Nation's business.

Mr. METZENBAUM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, before I address myself to the issue for which I rise, I commend the Senator from Georgia for taking the time to commend the young men and women who serve in our Armed Forces. I think he speaks for all of us when he says that we owe all of them a great debt of gratitude, and I join with him in indicating that appreciation to all of them.

And in passing, I might say to the Presiding Officer, to you, too, sir, we owe you a debt of gratitude for your service.

AMERICANS WANT ANSWERS

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, for the past 15 months, I have traveled the Nation on behalf of the Coalition for Democratic Values, an organization I chair, and have listened to Americans who are hurting.

From Boston to Atlanta, from California to Iowa, I have watched the frustration of our citizens grow as the President's short and shallow recession has grown deeper and wider, and I have listened to the testimony of people who are struggling to keep their heads above water.

These Americans want answers, answers about our crumbling infrastructure, our dismantled manufacturing base, the surge of foreign imports, and the squeezing of the middle class.

The President promises those answers and more tonight. It is about time.

Until now, the only domestic policy action that appeals to the President is the veto. The Congress has passed a textile bill, a housing bill, a parental leave bill, a minimum wage bill, and on and on. All vetoed. More vetoes than any elected President in nearly 40 years. What is more, he has threatened to veto more than 200 times. George Bush issues veto threats against legislation before it is even written.

I have said it before and I say it again, I do not want to hear about his threats of a veto. I think we in Congress have to do our job. But this President is planning vetoes for a health care bill, a campaign reform bill, a striker replacement bill—it goes on. The list is a long one. Take your pick. It reflects a kind of negativism. It is a kind of trying to govern by negative thinking, threats of vetoes rather than sitting down and working with the Congress to develop a positive economic program for this country.

So I am interested in this President's change of heart. I am also skeptical. I expect we will hear about the same old repackaged and warmed over pet proposals that the administration has trotted out year after year.

Mr. President, the people of America want new thinking, with real answers.

Last week, the Coalition for Democratic Values put forth a detailed proposal for the long-term growth of the American economy. It has been endorsed by economists like Lester Thurow, John Kenneth Galbraith, and Robert Reich, and business people like Bill McSweeney of Occidental Petroleum and Bernard Rappaport of American Income Life Insurance Co. It also is supported by labor leaders, elected officials, mayors, and educators.

It was put together under the leadership of a committee chaired by Ray Marshall, the former Secretary of Labor in the Carter administration, and Marcus Alexis, a very distinguished professor of Northwestern University.

I ask unanimous consent that the economic proposals put forward by that group be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A NEW PROGRAM FOR SUSTAINED GROWTH: THE COALITION FOR DEMOCRATIC VALUES' PROGRAM FOR A HIGH-WAGE, HIGH-PRODUCTIVITY ECONOMY

The dramatic events of 1991 provide a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for Americans to redirect our nation's resources to social investment and economic growth. The Coalition for Democratic Values has made such a program our top priority for 1992.

We call for important changes in the 1990 congressional budget agreement, including as a first step, breaking down the artificial "firewall" set up between domestic spending and spending for defense, half of which goes to protect Western Europe against a country which no longer exists.

Specific elements of our domestic program include: (1) Increasing public investment in human resources, physical infrastructure and public services by $100 billion over five years, with $50 billion in the first year. Much of this money would go to states and localities to fund ready-to-go programs put on hold because of fiscal crises. (2) New and expanded initiatives in job training and retraining; a complete restructuring of the higher education finance system; and guaranteed access to quality public education. (3) Universal health care, expanded preventive care for pregnant women and children; and other pro-family initiatives including family leave; and (4) Help for communities affected by the defense "drawdown."

In the short-term, these programs would be paid for by: (1) Savings from the military budget of a further $150 billion by reducing the money spent to defend Europe against a threat that no longer exists, scrapping the B-2 program, and restricting SDI to research and development. A special five-year investment fund would be established with the savings; (2) A new private sector initiative whereby companies allocate one percent of payroll to job training; (3) Establishing a fourth income-tax bracket at 35%, a "millionaire's surtax"; and (4) Eliminating government "pork" projects that have not cleared the normal appropriations process.

In addition, we call for trade policies that: (1) Create disincentives for American companies to relocate off-shore; (2) Reverse America's tradition of passively allowing greater access to our markets than other nations allow us in return; and (3) Discourage other nations from unfairly exploiting the environment and their people.

To build consensus on reaching these goals and to identify new ones on the sectorial and micro-economic level, we urge the formation of a permanent, bi-partisan, public- and private-sector Economic Policy Council.

America's greatness can be revitalized and re-affirmed for the next century, but not if we only pursue short-term policies designed to increase consumption. This document outlines a realistic plan that can be put into action now, and put much-needed resources to work for the nation's future.

1. THE CURRENT ECONOMIC RECESSION

Prompt governmental action is needed to end the recession. Extended unemployment benefits, while necessary, are not enough. Middle class tax relief could help, but a one-time rebate should not undercut public investment now for the long term.

The domestic economy—buffeted by massive layoffs, budget deficits, the savings and loan bailout and other problems—needs an immediate "shot in the arm" that can simultaneously improve short-term demand and long-term productivity. A priority is increased federal commitment to funding infrastructure and basic public services in pub-

lic safety, health care, education, social and environmental services. The framework for implementing many programs for productive investment is already in place; state and local governments have substantial numbers of ready-to-go projects—schools, roads, bridges, hospitals—on hold because of fiscal crises.

A five-year investment of $100 billion, being with $50 billion this year, above and beyond current measures like the 1991 transportation bill would 1) clearly provide sufficient stimulus to help bring the economy out of recession and 2) pay for much needed public investments that will increase private sector productivity, profitability and employment for the long-term, no matter when the recession ends.

Such an investment program should be financed by a five-year Special Investment Fund based on reduced defense spending. By using funds allocated to an outmoded defense of Eastern Europe, the fund would pay for itself over five years and would not contribute to the long term federal debt. Deficits in this Fund during the recession would be offset by surpluses as recovery accelerates.

2. INVESTING IN AMERICA FOR GROWTH

America must adopt a high-wage, sustainable growth strategy to promote our long term economic well-being. In today's highly competitive global economy, we cannot compete by driving wages down, transferring production facilities outside the US, investing only in new off-shore facilities or ignoring our environment or worker safety and health. Real growth means improvement in productivity, in wages and in the quality of life, not merely expansion for its own sake.

In the long run, the US economy will prosper and provide a broadbase of well-paid jobs only if this country becomes a more attractive place for productive and environmentally sensitive investments. This must be a nation where foreign and domestic businesses increasingly choose to utilize our workforce and infrastructure and not just our markets, and where our own businesses create new facilities instead of moving their operations to Mexico, Asia or other off-shore facilities.

To achieve these goals, the US must invest more heavily in education, job-training and physical infrastructure. We must develop a system for reaching consensus about national economic priorities and where to target our resources. We must have a trade policy that is fair with rules for co-operation. Specific elements of this program:

(a) Comprehensive Job Training. A high-wage, high-growth strategy depends on making America's workforce the world's best-trained and educated. The quality of our workforce and infrastructure will determine the desirability of the US as a location for high-skill jobs and investment. Making the US workforce the highest quality in the world will require major new public programs:

A national, private-sector initiative to provide training for front-line workers. Companies should be given the choice of either allocating 1% of their payroll for job training or paying 1% of their payroll into a separate fund for worker education and training.

Higher academic and behavior standards in America's public schools with a full commitment to providing the resources, staff, and programs to help all students meet high standards.

School-to-work transition programs centered in public schools, community colleges and vocational and technical schools.

Alternative education centers to provide high academic skills for young people who need options besides traditional high schools. These "youth centers" could build on the experience of the highly successful Job Corps and should be available not only to the disadvantaged, but to all non-college bound youth.

Special efforts to meet the skill development and supportive needs of minorities and women, who will constitute over 90% of the workforce growth during the 1990s.

(b) Economic Policy Council. There is growing evidence that greater cooperation between and within the public and private sectors great improves national economies. Such consensus processes do not substitute for regular public or private decision-making, but strengthen the process by providing all parties better information and narrowing the range of conflict, especially over trivial matters.

We therefore believe the US should create an Economic Policy Council. This council would comprise high level public and private representatives to build consensus on economic goals, priorities and strategies including fairer distribution of general economic gains, and more participation in the economic decisions that affect people's lives. It would be bipartisan and adequately staffed to provide the best available information and analyses of economic priorities. Unlike the president's Council of Economic Advisors, the EPC would be charged with establishing goals and making specific recommendations on a sector and micro-economic basis. The terms of the private sector members of the EPC should be staggered to permit continuity when administrations change.

(c) Preventing corporate flight to low-wage nations. US-based corporations often seek short-term cost competitiveness advantages by closing down U.S. operations and reopening in foreign countries where wages, benefits and the environmental and other costs may well be lower.

Under present law, companies which decide to move to other nations aren't required to defray the costs of closing U.S. facilities. "Internalizing" the social costs would therefore be good economics and good public policy. Making firms responsible for all their costs force companies to take longer time perspectives. Requiring them to bear a larger share of the costs of change, as is done in most other countries, creates disincentives to low-wage strategies.

We therefore recommend a two-part policy to eliminate these incentives to ship production jobs out of the United States:

It's good economic policy to require firms to pay the full cost of production and therefore we should not subsidize companies in shifting to overseas locations. We should create disincentives for companies that close down operations here and reopen them in other countries.

The U.S. should have positive adjustment policies that promote an equitable sharing of costs and benefits of change. We might create adjustment funds into which all companies should pay. These funds could be patterned after the liabilities companies currently incur to meet their environmental pollution costs.

(d) Economic conversion. The Cold War's end poses new challenges to the U.S. economy. While the potential to significantly reduce defense spending makes resources available for social uses, it also will mean shifting much defense industrial capacity to civilian uses, decommissioning military bases, and reducing significantly direct and indirect military employment.

A comprehensive program for the conversion of our defense industrial establishment is an urgent priority. Nearly 150,000 defense industry workers were laid off in 1990 and over 100,000 in 1991. A well-conceived economic adjustment plan must include the following initiatives:

Economic incentives for advance planning to develop new products, retool, reorganize production, develop marketing capabilities and retrain managements, engineers and others for commercial work.

Community economic redevelopment funding and assistance for adjusting to base closure and major reductions at military plants.

An adequately funded worker adjustment policy to provide job training, income maintenance and job relocation benefits.

A small business assistance program to help subcontractors and supplier firms, who are often the first to be affected by cutbacks.

America is also facing serious long-term environmental problems associated with our defense-energy weapons complex and with various toxic waste problems at defense bases. Solving these will require coherent and coordinated efforts by the federal government.

(e) Open but fair trade. All countries, especially the U.S., have much to gain from an open and expanding international economy. There are, however, two preconditions to a healthy international economy.

Trade must take place within rules that prevent economic or environmental exploitation. Trade-linked standards help strengthen the global economy by encouraging competition on the basis of efficiency and by improving living and working standards for workers in all countries, which in turn fuels global demand for imported products. Standards that expand worker rights abroad will protect American jobs as well. These standards should be complemented with domestic income and training assistance to cushion trade-induced dislocation.

Trading nations must recognize that it is natural for countries to have active policies to promote the interest of their domestic economies. Under conditions of greater worldwide economic parity, the United States can no longer passively allow other countries greater access to our country than they provide to theirs.

Finally, since environmental degradation does not respect international political boundaries, sustainable economic development requires a formal recognition of the environmental and employee protection costs of production.

3. ADDRESSING THE NEEDS OF AMERICA'S FAMILIES

The short-term and long-term economic problems facing this country fall disproportionately on middle- and low-income families, who bear the brunt of skyrocketing health care costs, rising costs for education and declining services at the state and local level. For what they get in return, middle-income families pay an unfair share of the tax burden. Meanwhile, families with two wage earners, many of whom barely bring in the income that one wage earner brought in 20 years ago, perform a daily balancing act that pits work against family life.

Our country needs to provide relief to America's families. Such a program must include:

(a) Universal access to quality public schools. Quality education is a right of every American, and all American families should be assured that their children have access to schools that have high standards for aca-

demic excellence, adequate facilities and textbooks, a safe and well-disciplined school environment, and a diverse program that helps prepare American youth for the challenges of the next century.

Every community must assume the responsibility for setting goals and supporting programs that help meet the National Education Goals. And when a community does not have the resources to attract and retain quality staff and maintain adequate facilities and programs, state and federal governments must provide the assistance necessary to assure access to educational opportunity.

(b) Affordable higher education. Our system of financing higher education needs to be fundamentally restructured. The balance between grants and loans needs to be shifted. Additional grants must be available to low- and middle-income families. Student loans must be made universal, available to everyone. The current system of the federal government providing costly guarantees to private banks and secondary market organizations must be replaced by a simpler and cheaper program of direct government lending. And the current system of repayment must be changed to one that is based on the individual's income after graduation.

This system of Universal, Direct, Income Contingent (UDIC) student assistance will re-open the doors of higher education to hundreds of thousands of young people, allow them greater choice in both their education and their occupations after school, and allow them to manage their debt in a rational way. It is also simpler to administer and will save enough funds from the current system to allow an expansion of direct grants to needy students, as well as merit based and early incentive programs.

(c) Comprehensive national health insurance. America is facing a crisis in health care delivery. The cost of health care to the average family is soaring. Although America spends more on health care than any other advanced industrial country, and has the most advanced and sophisticated health care technology in the world, our health care delivery system in many basic ways is failing. We're paying more and more for health care and getting less and less real coverage.

A fair and rational health care system will result in savings not only to families and individuals, but to society at large. America needs to adopt a national health care system that includes the following elements:

Universal health insurance coverage for Americans. Nobody should lose insurance because she or he lost a job.

A single system of paying hospitals and physicians that establishes an overall limit on health spending and provides for greater efficiency and productivity in the health sector.

Preventive care and nutrition, especially for infants, pregnant women and children, a modest investment that can save billions of dollars in health care costs later in life.

Reducing the financial burden on America's businesses and workers that comes from out-of-control health care costs and undermines our international competitiveness.

Reducing high administrative costs and premiums common for health insurance offered to small businesses.

Stopping the exclusion from health care coverage of individuals who are higher risk or have pre-existing conditions.

(d) Tax equity. Even after the much-heralded reforms of 1981 and 1986, our tax code is rife with loopholes and deductions that benefit the wealthy over the rest of us. To help the great majority, America needs a tax break to the middle class—a children's tax credit, an income tax credit for social security and medicare taxes or some other form of relief. It should be paid for by a "millionaire's surtax," a fourth individual income tax bracket of 35% for high-earning individuals and couples. We should not simply turn the peace dividend into a one-time rebate to stimulate consumption.

(e) Family and parental leave. Our competitor nations all demand that employers help parents meet their dual responsibilities as parents and workers, especially with the birth of a child or care of an ill family member. We especially need to get companies here to accommodate the realities brought on by the influx of tens of millions of women into the permanent workforce since 1970.

(f) Expanded housing programs to address the needs of the growing number of homeless and the decline of affordable housing for middle income people.

CUTTING GOVERNMENT WASTE

Hundreds of pet projects are tacked onto the budget each year, long after the authorization and appropriations processes are concluded. Regardless of their merit, these hidden appropriations should be halted, and all appropriations should undergo the full scrutiny and open debate of the regular budget process. Eliminating the classic "pork" projects will yield untold savings in the future.

CONCLUSION

No matter where one stands on the political spectrum, it's obvious that America, like the rest of the world, stands at an historic crossroads. We can choose the path that leads to greater economic security and a sustainable, high-wage, high-productivity economy, or continue down the road to second-class status as a nation, our greatness reduced to a sentimental reminiscence. The choice has never been clearer, the stakes have never been higher. The time to decide is now.

COALITION FOR DEMOCRATIC VALUES' ECONOMIC SECURITY PAPER

The following economists, business people, labor leaders, elected officials and prominent individuals have endorsed the principles of the Coalition for Democratic Values Economic Policy Paper (organizations named are for identification purposes only):

Marcus Alexis (CDV Economic Policy Committee Co-chair), Northwestern University.

Morton Bahr, President, Communications Workers of America.

Nancy Barrett, Provost and Vice President Academic Affairs, Western Michigan University.

Bob Bergland, Executive Vice President, National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA).

Norman Birnbaum, Georgetown School of Law.

Barry Bluestone, McCormick Institute, University of Massachusetts.

Bob Borosage, Institute for Policy Studies.

Samuel Bowles, University of Massachusetts.

Bob Brandon, Vice-President, Citizen Action of Washington, DC.

Don Cameron, Executive Director, National Education Association.

Edward Carlough, President, Sheet Metal Workers Union.

Karen Davis, Professor and Chairman, Dept. of Health Policy and Management, Johns Hopkins School of Hygiene and Public Health.

Jeff Faux, President, Economic Policy Institute.

Howard D. Samuel, Industrial Union Department.

Lester C. Thurow, Sloan School of Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Kathleen Kennedy Townsend, Director, Maryland Student Service Alliance.

Richard Trumka, President, United Mine Workers of America.

Steven Veiderman, Jessie Smith Noyes Foundation.

Mr. Paul Warnke, Former Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Partner, Howrey & Simon.

Roger Wilkins, Robinson Professor, George Mason University.

William Julius Wilson, Lucy Flower University Professor of Sociology, University of Chicago.

Alan Wurtzel CEO, President, Circuit City Stores, Inc.

James Galbraith, LBJ Sc§hool of Public Policy.

John Kenneth Galbraith, Paul M. Warburg Professor of Economics Emeritis, Harvard University.

David Gordon, New School for Social Research.

Dr. Sydney Harman, President, Harman International, Inc.

Heidi Hartmann, Director, Institute for Women's Policy Research.

Bennett Harrison, Carnegie-Mellon University.

Roger Hickey, Vice-President, Economic Policy Institute.

Jim Hightower, Former Texas Secretary of Agriculture.

George Kourpias, President, International Association of Machinists.

Ray Marshall (CDV Economic Policy Committee Co-chair), LBJ School of Public Affairs, University of Texas at Austin.

Jay Mazur, President, International Ladies Garment Workers Union.

Gerald McEntee, President, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees.

Dorothy McSweeny.

William McSweeny, Former CEO, Occidental Petroleum Inc.

Michael Piore, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Bernard Rapoport, Chairman of the Board, American Income Life Insurance Company.

Robert B. Reich, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University.

ADDITIONAL COALITION FOR DEMOCRATIC VALUES, ECONOMIC POLICY COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Debra DeLee, Director of Legislative Affairs, National Education Association.

Peter Dreier, Director of Housing, Boston Redevelopment Authority.

Barbara Easterling, Vice President, Communication's Workers of America.

Reg Gilliam, Chief of Staff, Congressman Louis Stokes.

Donna Gold, Senior Professional Associate, National Education Association.

Joseph Gould, Writer, Public Affairs Director.

Jim Grossfeld, Director, Media Relations, United Mine Workers of America.

Steven Jonas, M.D.

Jeremy Karpatkin (Primary drafter of the document), Deputy Chief of Staff, Senator Paul Simon.

Jerry Klepner, Director of Legislation, American Federation of State and County Employees.

David Kusnet, Writer.

Howard Leibowitz, Director of Federal Relations, Boston Mayor Raymond Flynn.

Rick McGahey, Legislative Assistant, Senator Edward Kennedy.

Phil McLaurin, Manager of Information Services Unit, National Education Association.

Segundo Mercado-Lorens, Associate Director, Public Affairs Dept., Director, Legislative Affairs, United Food and Commercial Workers.

Reggie Newell, Director of Research, International Association of Machinists.

Anthony Podesta, Podesta Associates.

Michael Pons, Senior Professional Associate, National Education Association.

Howard D. Samuel, Industrial Union Department.

Members of Congress

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy.
Sen. Howard M. Metzenbaum.
Sen. Paul Simon.
Sen. Paul D. Wellstone.
Rep. Neil Abercrombie.
Rep. Les AuCoin.
Rep. Ronald V. Dellums.
Rep. Fortney Pete Stark.
Rep. Louis Stokes.
Rep. Ted Weiss.
Rep. Sidney R. Yates.

Mayors

J.E. Bud Clark, Mayor, City of Portland.

Peter Clavelle, Mayor, City of Burlington.

John Daniels, Mayor, City of New Haven.

Richard Clay Dixon, Mayor, City of Dayton.

Raymond Flynn, Mayor, City of Boston.

Donald Fraser, Mayor, City of Minneapolis.

Sharpe James, Mayor, City of Newark.

John O. Norquist, Mayor, City of Milwaukee.

Pete Sferrazza, Mayor, City of Reno.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Our proposal calls for a major redirection of our Nation's resources toward social investment and economic growth.

The 1990 budget agreement needs to be revised to permit a shift in defense spending to other social spending programs.

Specifically, our proposal calls for:

First, increased public investment in human resources, infrastructure, and public services by $100 billion over 5 years;

Second, expanded job training and retraining programs;

Third, guaranteed access to quality public education;

Fourth, universal health care; and

Fifth, assistance to communities hit by the defense drawdown.

These new programs would be paid for by cuts in defense programs.

Mr. President, the President of the United States has an opportunity this evening to bring forth some new positive actions, some new positive efforts, to reawaken this country out of the economic recession which it is in. We all wish him well, but I am afraid we are going to get more of the same.

Mr. President, I am prepared, as one Member of this body, to work with the President in a positive way to bring this country out of the recession and make this Nation the competitor worldwide that we want it to be and know that it can be. I believe that together we can put our people back to work and give this economy the vitality which it is possible of having.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

RECESS UNTIL 2:15 P.M.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senate will stand in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 1 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:15 p.m. whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. ADAMS].

STRENGTHENING EDUCATION FOR AMERICAN FAMILIES ACT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill

AMENDMENT NO. 1479

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be 10 minutes' debate on the Nickles amendment No. 1479. Who seeks recognition?

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and ask the time be equally charged to both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Texas is recognized.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes, and ask that that be called to my attention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENTSEN. I understand the appeal of the Learnfare concept. All of us want our children to get a better education, to make this Nation competitive in the world's economy. And the idea behind the Learnfare proposal is being tested in the State of Wisconsin under waiver by the Secretary of HHS.

But there are important differences between what is being proposed by the Nickles amendment and the Kasten amendment this afternoon, from what is taking place in Wisconsin. Under this amendment, a 6-year-old who misses school because his mother is a drug addict could lose his public assistance benefits without anyone paying any attention to what that child really needs, which is help in getting his mother off drugs.

In other words, we must ensure that innocent children are not the victims of a policy that fails to include reasonable safeguards.

When the administration approved Learnfare for young children in Wisconsin it looked for a balance, a safety net, to be sure that that child gets help with that problem, the one that is interfering with it going to school. The problem you are running into is that you make a study of this situation where children miss school, and you find in 41 percent of the cases they are either in the children's court, or you are finding an indication of an abusive parent or a drug addict. And you are not looking back to the problems that are causing that child to miss school.

That is what we are trying to take care of.

Senators ought to also note that a report with an evaluation of Wisconsin's Learnfare Program will be released at the end of this month. I think Senators ought to wait and at least see what that report carries out before they take a stand on this issue.

The other point is, this is the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. We have Senator MOYNIHAN, who is quite prepared as chairman of that subcommittee, to see that this is included in the study in his hearings.

I yield 2 minutes to my friend, the chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I would like vigorously to endorse the statement of the distinguished chairman of the Finance Committee. This amendment would be an amendment to the Social Security Act. That is not on the floor.

Our committee will be holding hearings this coming Monday. We have invited the distinguished Senators from Wisconsin and from Oklahoma to testify. We will hear from the administration. We will hear from all those who are concerned parties, and there are many. And we will learn more about the evaluation when it comes.

I urge the Senate to follow the lead of the chairman of the Finance Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, how much time do I have left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 56 seconds remaining.

Mr. BENTSEN. I withhold the remainder of my time.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, how much time do I have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, this amendment, the so-called Learnfare amendment, is an amendment that basically would allow States to have some connection between welfare benefits and compulsory school attendance, without the need of a waiver from the Department of Health and Human Services. This was an amendment, frankly, that came to me from individuals who were in public housing, who said: This system does not work very well. There are a lot of these young-

sters who are not going to school. We ought to put some kind of restrictions on to make them go to school.

This legislation allows the States to set up a program that encourages welfare recipients to have their kids in schools. If the State wishes to have a reduction in welfare benefits as an inducement to get these youngsters in school so be it. This allows the States the flexibility to do so. Right now, they run into a roadblock; they run into a hurdle. They run into the Department of HHS. Sometimes it takes months to obtain a waiver from HHS.

Actually, the State of Wisconsin, I think, was working on this for about 2½ years. One permit took 5 months; another permit took 10 months. But if you look from the time they started their program to the time they got there ultimate permit, you are talking about a period of a couple of years.

Governors and others want the flexibility. They want to have these programs work. They want to have welfare recipients get their children in school so they can break the cycle of governmental dependency; so they can keep people from dropping out of school, and ending up in trouble. Many are in jail because they did not go to school. Many end up depending on welfare; many end up on unemployment; and, in many cases, they end up in jail.

I have three letters: one from the Governor of Oklahoma urging adoption of this amendment; one from the Oklahoma State School Board Association, which also urges adoption of this amendment; and, likewise, a letter from Big Brothers and Big Sisters of Oklahoma City. I will read this one sentence:

A well-prepared, educated, and literate child has unlimited opportunities and I support any legislation that promotes and demands school attendance.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that excerpts from the letters be printed in the RECORD and I reserve the remainder of my time.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA STATE
SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Oklahoma City, OK, January 28, 1992.

Hon. DON NICKLES,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR NICKLES: Oklahoma Task Force 2000 recommended correlation between AFDC payments and school attendance. We see your proposal as one way to deal with high student dropout rates and other problems associated with at-risk students.

Sincerely,

WALT HUSHBECK,
President.
Dr. BOB MOONEYHAM,
Executive Director.

BIG BROTHERS, BIG SISTERS,
OF GREATER OKLAHOMA CITY,
Oklahoma City, OK, January 21, 1992.

ERNIE SCHULTZ,
Director of Communications, Senator Don Nickles, Oklahoma,
Hart Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SCHULTZ: I am continually impressed with the Senator's commitment to the children of this state and country and agree wholeheartedly with the Senators comments concerning education and breaking the welfare dependency cycle.

A well-prepared, educated and literate child has unlimited opportunities and I support any legislation that promotes and demands school attendance. Please continue to keep me informed of the Senator's agenda.

Regards,

JAMIE L. TYSON,
Executive Director.

STATE OF OKLAHOMA,
WASHINGTON, DC OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 28, 1992.

Hon. DON NICKLES,
U.S. Senate, Hart Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR NICKLES: I am writing in support of your amendment to S. 2, the "Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act" which allows states the flexibility needed to implement innovative education and welfare reforms without onerous and cumbersome regulatory barriers.

The objectives of the "Learnfare" program which your amendment addresses are commendable. Unfortunately, it has been difficult for states to implement such creative programs due to an intransigent bureaucracy. I applaud your efforts on behalf of states' regulatory relief in order to benefit Oklahoma citizens dependent on state and federal assistance.

The link between the lack of an education and poverty has been clearly demonstrated. If we can break the cycle of despair and welfare dependency through compulsory education then we can honestly say our economic recovery has begun.

Sincerely,

DAVID WALTERS,
Governor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, how much time is left on each side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma has 1 minute and 24 seconds. The Senator from Texas has 56 seconds.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, who is very interested and concerned about this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KOHL. Mr. President, I would just say a few words in opposition to Kasten-Nickles. I come from Wisconsin, where Learnfare originated, and I am in favor of it. But what we must be certain of is that we do not have 50 different Learnfares. What we want to do is give HHS an opportunity to review Learnfare proposals, if necessary on an expedited basis, but be certain all of them are constructive and humane. That is all we are attempting to do here.

We want to refer this back to the Finance Committee where it belongs, to have hearings, so when we finish up with the Learnfare concept, it is humane, constructive, and gives the Government an opportunity to oversee in a very general way the expenditure of our AFDC funds.

So I think it is in our best interest not to turn down Learnfare because we are not interested in turning down Learnfare but simply to refer it to the Finance Committee for the proper kind of oversight hearings before we adopt a Learnfare proposal to apply to our entire country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator BOND be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I yield such time as is necessary to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTEN. I thank the Senator. Mr. President, let me point out quickly, this amendment is not mandatory. It does not mean we are establishing a Learnfare program all across the country. What it says is we are going to allow Governors and State legislatures the flexibility. It was a Democratic State Senate, a Democratic assembly, and a Republican Governor in the State of Wisconsin that came together to pass this program, and then it took between 5 and 16 or 18 months for the Federal bureaucracy to, in effect, endorse Wisconsin's programs.

Quick statistics in Wisconsin will tell you how it has worked. In January of 1990, 9 percent of welfare families were sanctioned under Learnfare. As of December, 2.1 percent were sanctioned. We are making progress in Wisconsin. The fact is we have 97.9 percent of families now attending school. We are making progress. It turns out that this works. This is an incentive, but we are not saying to anyone they have to do what Wisconsin has done. What we are saying is we will give Republican Governors, Democratic Governors, Republican State legislators, and Democratic State legislators the opportunity. All we are seeking is to cut the bureaucratic red tape, give State legislatures and Governors the opportunity to move forward on these kinds of reforms.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise to oppose the Learnfare amendment offered by my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

I do so reluctantly, Mr. President, because I agree with the intent of the authors of this amendment—that children in AFDC families should be encouraged to stay in school and earn a high school diploma.

Numerous studies, over many years, have shown the importance of education to gaining financial independence.

And, breaking the cycle of dependence on welfare will require an increased emphasis on education and on job skill development.

That is why I was proud to join with my distinguished colleague from New York, Senator MOYNIHAN, in authoring the Family Support Act of 1988.

But, we also have much to learn from oversight of the work and education incentive provisions of that legislation.

I am personally looking forward to actively participating in the hearings on these issues that the chairman of the Finance Committee has promised the authors of the amendment now before us.

Mr. President, I believe that changes of this significance should not come without careful study—study of both the experience in Wisconsin under that State's Learnfare Program and the experience we have had with other work and education incentives under the 1988 welfare reform legislation.

One reality we should have learned by now is that simply forcing young people to attend school does not guarantee that they will gain a good education.

And, we must also get beyond the mentality that suggests that all of society's problems—drugs, alcohol, dysfunctional families, AIDS—must be dumped on teachers and dumped on schools.

These are the community's problems, Mr. President, and I for one believe it is well past the time that the community should begin assuming responsibility for dealing with them.

Just 2 weeks ago, I had the opportunity to visit the New Vistas School in Minneapolis that is drawing on a wide range of community resources to do just that.

New Vistas is a Minneapolis Public School located in facilities made available by Honeywell, Inc., in its corporate headquarters. New Vistas is a school for pregnant teens and for teen mothers. The students in this school are expected to fulfill all the requirements of other students in Minneapolis high schools.

But, the New Vistas School is based on the assumption that society has many different responsibilities in helping these young students complete their education.

That is why this school is considered an integral part of Success by Six, a communitywide school readiness program initiated several years ago by the United Way, under the leadership of Honeywell CEO Jim Renier and many other business and community leaders in Minneapolis.

That is why health services are available in this school provided, not by the Minneapolis Public School System, but by nearby Children's Medical Center and by the Minneapolis Public Health Department.

And, that is why numerous other health, nutrition, transportation, counseling, and other social services are made available to these students from a wide variety of community resources.

Perhaps not every school can make available such a wide range of services beyond traditional education services, Mr. President.

But, without that kind of community acceptance of responsibility for dealing with the myriad of issues and problems many young people and their families face, I seriously doubt that simply requiring children in AFDC families to attend school will accomplish the very important aims of the amendment we have before us today.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, I believe the authors of this amendment have raised issues and a dilemma that we can no longer afford to ignore.

That is why I am so pleased that the chairman of the Finance Committee has promised to provide a proper forum for beginning the job we all know needs to be done.

I look forward to playing an active part in the hearing and oversight process that the distinguished chairman has promised us.

But, until we have both a proper context and better information on which we can base our judgment on such an important issue, I must oppose the amendment we now have before us.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I rise to commend my colleagues from Oklahoma and Wisconsin for bringing the issue of Learnfare before the Senate. I believe that linking welfare programs to school attendance may well be meritorious and I look forward to following the results of the three States—Wisconsin, Ohio, and Florida—who are currently experimenting with this concept. While my own State of Oregon does not have plans to implement Learnfare at this time, officials in my State will also be watching the results of these initiatives with great interest. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the Department of Health and Human Services will soon release a report on Learnfare initiatives. This data promises to help us at the Federal level carefully evaluate the effectiveness of this concept.

While I believe this concept has merit, I am casting my vote to table this amendment today primarily because the data is not yet in on the experiments in Learnfare being conducted across this country. It is my understanding that members of the Finance Committee have committed to holding hearings on this issue once the results are known from each of these projects. Further examination is necessary before we encourage States to conduct these experiments across the board.

I am a strong supporter of federalism and the notion of States serving as laboratories for new ideas and approaches. Many of our greatest programs, such as Medicaid, Medicare, and Social Security were first initiated by States which identified a problem and set out to find a solution. As we all know, several of these trial balloons have now become major Federal programs.

The goal of our welfare system, Mr. President, must be to expand educational and economic opportunities as well as to meet the immediate needs of individuals and families. Of course, any program of assistance to those in need must be structured to encourage its recipient to be productive, creative, and responsible members of our society. It may turn out that Learnfare programs will encourage greater responsibility in AFDC recipients, however, the data is not yet in. Let us gather the evidence before we act. When the lives of children and families are at stake, we have no greater obligation.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, I rise today to voice my support for the Bentsen motion to table the Nickles-Kasten amendment. By supporting the motion to table, I do not mean in any way to imply that I am opposed to the goals of Learnfare. I worry that the supporters of the Nickles-Kasten amendment will attempt to portray the opponents of the amendment as "opposed to welfare reform," or "opposed to school attendance," or some other such nonsense. But such is simply not the case: We all know the value of obtaining a solid education, we all know school attendance is important, and we all know that our welfare system can stand improvement in numerous ways.

I understand the motivation behind the Nickles-Kasten amendment. I wholeheartedly endorse the goal of promoting educational attainment for all our children, which, on the surface, this amendment seems to do. Upon closer look, however, I have to conclude that this amendment is not the right way to promote that worthy goal. It is important to keep in mind that the law already permits any State to enact Learnfare. In fact, the Family Support Act of 1988 gave wide latitude to States to enact changes in their welfare systems, making them more incentive-driven, and I think that is highly commendable. So the Nickles-Kasten amendment does not permit Learnfare—that has been allowed since 1988—but rather the amendment would allow any State to implement a Learnfare program without going through an approval process with the Department of Health and Human Services. There is much evidence, however, to suggest that this approval process is beneficial. When the State of Wisconsin came up with the idea to implement Learnfare, they began working with the Department of Health and Human Services to obtain the waiver they needed. As State officials dis-

cussed their plan with the Department, they greatly improved their Learnfare plan over the original proposal. The new plan tied the Learnfare Program with case management, so that if, let's say, a fourth grader was repeatedly missing school, instead of just summarily cutting AFDC benefits to that child's family, a case worker would try to discover why that child was missing school: Did she have a health problem? Was she in an abusive home environment? Had some family crisis arisen? Then the caseworker could try to alleviate the problematic situation. Without the requirement of obtaining a waiver, this critically important social service component would have been left out of the Wisconsin plan. Furthermore, the Department of Health and Human Services required an evaluation of the plan, so we will be able to see how effective it has been and also what negative effects it may have had. This evaluation requirement is important, and we should not undermine it, but unfortunately the Nickles-Kasten amendment would do so.

The goal of a waiver requirement is not to burden States with additional paperwork or redtape: The goal of the waiver process is to make sure that changes in a State's welfare system are not harmful to children or solely punitive without offering any meaningful improvements. In addition, when granting waivers, Federal administrators seek to ensure that State plans are legally, properly, and fairly implemented and evaluated. For these very important reasons, the waiver requirement should remain in place. As I have already stated, we should remember that a waiver requirement in no way prevents a State from undertaking a welfare reform program. The Family Support Act emphatically encourages States to reform the system. But that does not mean reform efforts should run amok or uncontrolled. If it now takes too long to have a waiver for welfare reform approved by the Department of HHS, we should encourage the Department to speed and improve their administrative procedures, but we need not do away altogether with their important role.

I have another concern about the Nickles-Kasten amendment; because it eliminates the waiver requirement for Learnfare programs but for no other welfare reform efforts, it provides a strong incentive for all the States to adopt Learnfare instead of some other improvement plan. Our 50 States would no longer be laboratories of innovation, with various States developing many different reform efforts. These State experiments give us the opportunity to evaluate alternative plans, so we learn much more about what works and what does not work. I voted to send this amendment to the Finance Committee to propose ways to encourage the creative efforts of so many talented people across the country. We do not want to drive all States to implement the same reform plan, but I am afraid the Nickles-Kasten amendment inadvertently would do this.

While offering all encouragement to States to develop their own welfare reform plans and to promote educational achievement for their at-risk students, I must join with Senator BENTSEN in asking that the Nickles-Kasten amendment be tabled.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired. All time on this amendment has expired. Under the previous order, the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] is recognized to make a motion to table.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I move to table the Nickles-Kasten amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a motion to table. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table amendment No. 1479. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 55, nays 43, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 7 Leg.]

YEAS—55

Adams	Exon	Mitchell
Akaka	Ford	Moynihan
Baucus	Glenn	Packwood
Bentsen	Gore	Pell
Biden	Graham	Pryor
Bingaman	Hatfield	Riegle
Bradley	Heflin	Robb
Breaux	Hollings	Rockefeller
Bryan	Inouye	Sanford
Burdick	Jeffords	Sarbanes
Byrd	Johnston	Sasser
Chafee	Kennedy	Shelby
Conrad	Kerry	Simon
Cranston	Kohl	Specter
Daschle	Lautenberg	Wellstone
DeConcini	Leahy	Wirth
Dixon	Levin	Wofford
Dodd	Metzenbaum	
Durenberger	Mikulski	

NAYS—43

Bond	Fowler	McCain
Boren	Garn	McConnell
Brown	Gorton	Murkowski
Bumpers	Gramm	Nickles
Burns	Grassley	Nunn
Coats	Hatch	Pressler
Cochran	Helms	Reid
Cohen	Kassebaum	Roth
Craig	Kasten	Rudman
D'Amato	Lieberman	Seymour
Danforth	Lott	Simpson
Dole	Lugar	
Domenici	Mack	
Smith	Symms	Wallop
Stevens	Thurmond	Warner

NOT VOTING—2

Harkin Kerrey

So the motion to lay on the table the amendment (No. 1479) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. DOMENICI. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, may we have order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Chair will state to the Senator from Massachusetts there is a prior order pending at this time which the Chair will now state:

AMENDMENT NO. 1490

Under the previous order, the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] is recognized to make a point of order against the Wirth amendment No. 1490. Then the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH] is recognized to make a motion to waive the Budget Act. Under the previous order, the time on the Wirth motion is limited to 2 hours equally divided and controlled by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI].

At this point the Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI] for the purposes of making a point of order.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

The Budget Act provides a point of order against consideration of legislation dealing with any matter, and I underline and concentrate on those two words, "any matter," which is within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee unless the Budget Committee reports the measure. This point of order keeps the Senate from attempting to address the budget in a piecemeal fashion or to pick apart the Budget Act. That is precisely what the Wirth amendment attempts to do, and it is clearly within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee.

This amendment is not just a matter of the Nation's children——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I state to the Senator that the point of order is not debatable. Under the previous order, the Chair will go to the Senator from Colorado for his motion, which is then debatable, and the time will be divided accordingly.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I have not made the point of order yet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. I was wondering——

Mr. DOMENICI. I ask that you charge those brief introductory remarks to my hour.

Pursuant to section 306 of the Budget Act, I raise a point of order against the Wirth amendment No. 1490.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A point of order has been raised against the amendment of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I move to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of amendment No. 1490.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time for debate on the motion to waive the Budget Act has been equally divided into 2 hours, controlled by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH] and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI].

At this point, the Chair recognizes the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, the sense-of-the-Senate resolution in front of the Senate today is a very simple resolution. Let me read the enabling language of the sense-of-the-Senate resolution:

It is the sense of the Senate that legislation should be enacted that realigns the 1990 budget agreement to reflect the two priorities of the American people. By shifting unnecessary military spending into domestic programs, including early childhood development, education, and job training, to promote the Nation's long-term economic growth and social well-being.

The word of great note in that is "including."

Mr. President, everybody in the U.S. Senate has talked about the fact that the cold war is over. Everybody here has talked about the fact that we as a Nation, as the world has changed, must work to change ourselves. I am sure that all 100 Members of the U.S. Senate have given speeches and talked to constituent groups about the need for investing in our own backyard, about the need for investing in education, in research and development, in plant and equipment, and increasing the productive capacity of this country. Every one of us has talked about investments in the future and the need for change. That is what this sense-of-the-Senate resolution is all about.

It says, "domestic programs including"—this is obviously not limited, as some have suggested, to one set of programs or another. It simply says that one of our priorities is obviously education. Presumably, the President is going to speak tonight in his State of the Union Address about the Head Start Program. Every one of us has spoken about that, in which only one child in four who is eligible is enrolled. Everybody, I believe, has said that we ought to enroll those other three out of four. That is the best investment we can make.

I bet everybody on the Senate floor has talked about investments in early childhood health, prenatal care, and immunization programs for children, early literacy, parent involvement programs. And everybody here, I am also sure has talked about the problem of access to higher education and the need to assure that everybody can go on to our flagship universities, regardless of social class or wealth; that higher education should not be the purview of the privileged few; that we should have a fluid society, and education and opportunity are the ladder of change in this country.

Education is the core ingredient to creating opportunity. I have heard it said over and over again.

This resolution started as a very simple idea in the discussions early last fall on S. 2, the bill in front of the Senate right now, a bill which deals with reform and change in American education.

Senator WELLSTONE and I sat through a number of those discussions. I am not on the Education Committee. Senator WELLSTONE is, but we sat and talked at great length about the need for change and how we are really going to foster that sort of change.

Obviously we want to see changes in schools. Obviously, we would like to see change in the support of education. And we also thought to ourselves, wait a minute, we cannot do any of these things, unless the walls in the budget agreement of 1990 are changed.

We have a cap on domestic expenditures, and we have a cap on defense expenditures. These limits were created prior to the fairly dramatic changes in the world.

Now everybody, I think, knows that it is time for a change. So, Senator WELLSTONE and I sat down with the help of Senators KENNEDY, SIMON, ADAMS, and others, and said, let us devise something that starts to make a statement about the need for this change in our spending and our priorities. Out of that came the Wirth-Wellstone amendment.

We were prepared to offer this amendment last fall, Mr. President, at the time when we thought the legislation was first going to come to the floor in the waning days of the 1st session. We then broke and went over a holiday break for Christmas and New Year's and came back here to begin work on the education bill. The sense-of-the Senate resolution was part of the unanimous-consent request agreed to last week and part of the unanimous-consent request agreed to last night.

Prior to today, there was no discussion or opposition. We thought that this was just a simple man's apple pie sort of resolution. We have all talked about investment in education and about the future, and we all know that defense spending is going to decrease.

I suspect that we all also know that the President is probably going to talk about that tonight, that we have to invest more in education, which we cannot do without changing the Budget Act or raising the deficit—something nobody wants to do. It is pretty simple arithmetic.

Well, now suddenly this has become a point of enormous contention. Why? I do not quite understand that. I would like to assure our colleagues on the other side that this was not intended in any way, shape, or form, to come up today before tonight's State of the Union Address. It was not intended in any way, shape, or form, as suggested by some, to embarrass the administration, to embarrass the President, to embarrass the Republicans, not by any means. We thought everybody would be in support of this, and this was to have happened last fall.

Now it got scheduled by unanimous consent last week, agreed to again last night, to occur this afternoon. So everybody knew this was happening. This was scarcely any kind dark-of-the-night maneuver.

Our intent is clearly to have the Senate go on record as every Senator, I suspect, has discussed, in saying that we ought to invest in education, that we ought to be investing in children of the future. Everybody has said that. And that unnecessary defense spending is going to get cut. We all know that is the case. The President will talk about that tonight. And that among the funds that are going to be made available when unnecessary defense spending is cut, those are going to go into programs such as education. I am also sure some of this will go into deficit reduction.

We are going to have a major tax bill and economic stimulus bill. We will have a lot of discussion on a public works program. There are going to be a significant number of demands on these funds. That will be part of the national debate in what this Congress addresses over the coming months.

Our statement was simply that included in these ought to be investments in education, and obviously some of us would like to place that at top of the list. That is my first priority. Others are going to have other priorities, and that is what this body is all about, to decide what their priorities are going to be.

So, Mr. President, this is a very simple resolution. It is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution, and there are no numbers in it. It does not say that nothing else can be funded except education. It says this includes education. A sense-of-the-Senate resolution, which says we ought to be moving funds from defense spending into education. I believe that, and I think probably most of us talked about that, and I am sure the country believes that is the case. That is one of the priorities we ought to have.

It is a very simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution. We need 60 votes, because anything that relates to the Budget Act that is not brought up in legislation reported by the Budget Committee requires a waiver of the Budget Act, and that, I gather, as the Senator from New Mexico has raised the point of order that unless we have

60 votes, we cannot even pass this very simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I hope that we will get agreement and everybody will agree to this basic and simple amendment.

So, Mr. President, having explained that, I have further comments, but I know a number of people would like to speak on this particular piece of legislation, and I will give up the floor to the Senator from New Mexico who, I know, has a statement he would like to make, and then I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRAHAM). The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, let me attempt to be as brief as I can. I have word now that about four or five Senators want to speak to this issue, and I want to make sure I leave time for them. I yield myself 6 minutes at this point, Mr. President.

Mr. President, this morning, although I was not present, the distinguished majority leader rose to talk about what he thought the United States ought to be doing over the next 3, 4, or 5 years. My recollection is that he said, as part of an economic growth package, we should have such things as long-term investment in research, high-speed rail technology, spending on infrastructure, tax cuts for middle-income Americans, and a package to help State and local governments through grants.

Mr. President, nothing highlights the fallacy of the Wirth resolution more than the words of the distinguished majority leader. The Wirth-Wellstone resolution decides what ought to be done for America, and leaves out all of the things mentioned by the leader.

What we ought to do, if we want to have a resolution of the type offered by Senator WIRTH, is we ought to pass around a piece of paper for 2 or 3 days to all Members of this body and ask Senators, one at a time: What is it you think we should do with any savings from a defense build-down? I know my friend from Missouri is going to question if there is any money available when we are bankrupt by our public debt. Based on the Wirth resolution, we are just going to spend more borrowed money, as I understand it.

I believe we ought to ask Senators to sign up for what they really think is important in terms of national spending. And then we ought to put a resolution on an education bill saying this is how we spend the money.

After each Senator has had his or her way, we ought to run the resolution right through here.

Well, as far as the Senator from New Mexico is concerned, it seems that the Wirth-Wellstone resolution is an effort by two Senators, both of whom I have great respect for, to sit down and write a very lengthy resolution covering everything about children and education that one could imagine. This resolution includes changing two of the current discretionary grant programs into entitlement programs. Senators WIRTH and WELLSTONE produced a masterpiece of ideas of activities that they want accomplished, and they then stand up and say it really is not anything big. They suggest we should not have anybody down here arguing about the resolution because it really means nothing. They claim it is just a little old thing.

Well, Mr. President, I believe it is more than just a nothing resolution. I think when we have these kind of resolutions we ought to come down here and talk about them and make sure that everybody understands what they are voting for. Make no mistake about it, if you vote for this resolution, you have decided that the peace dividend, however large or small, is going to be spent exactly the way the two Senators who proposed the resolution want it spent. Perhaps there are three or four other Senators that, in a casual or more formal way, joined around a table to write up this agenda, an agenda directing how to spend any defense savings over the next 5 years.

Frankly, I really do not think this is the way to do business. I do not think this is the way to tell one group of Americans, in our home State or elsewhere, about all of the good things we are doing here in Congress for children. As a matter of fact, this resolution is not a binding resolution. Nonetheless, my colleagues want credit for what it alleges to do for children on the one hand, and on the other hand they do not want anyone to challenge the resolution because it is, really, nonbinding. Well, I challenge it today.

I do not think this is the way we ought to do things. I do not think we ought to speculate on where the defense savings, if any, ought to go during debate on an education bill. Today, the President is going to tell us his priorities for the next year or two. The President's plan is being revealed long before the time when many Democrats, including the leadership of the Democrats in the Senate, have put finishing touches on their recovery plan. And I assume they have one.

I would doubt seriously, if something is put together with both short-term and long-term objectives for our Nation, that all of the defense savings are going to go to the specific programs mentioned in the Wirth amendment. And I will start calling the Democratic plan for defense cuts the $100 billion cut because I understand that is what the distinguished majority leader advocates, a $100 billion reduction in defense. It would be interesting to know how we are going to get that accomplished.

But spending this $100 billion, according to this resolution, is to be accomplished according to the way and whim and wish and desire of a few Senators who put this resolution on this education bill before us today.

Having said that, I will, before we finish, challenge seriously some statements made about how much children's programs in the United States have suffered in the last 3 or 4 years. I must be looking at a completely different set of numbers. I find nothing that shows children's programs have increased by 5 percent. I can tick off five or six that went up 35 and 40 percent. I can list new children's programs that did not even exist 2 years ago that are now funded at half a billion dollars.

That is not to say that the Senator from New Mexico is arguing here on the floor that we should not do more for children in our budget.

Having said that, I would like to have either Senator KASSEBAUM, who wants to raise an issue on part of this resolution, or Senator DANFORTH, engage in some discourse on the subject.

I yield the floor and will wrap up my thoughts when my colleagues have finished with their views.

Mr. DANFORTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I would like, with the indulgence of the Senator from New Mexico, to engage him in a discussion at this point because I have very great respect for Senator DOMENICI. He is the ranking member of the Budget Committee. He has served on the Budget Committee for many years. He served as chairman of the committee for I think 6 years. And if anybody understands the budget process, he does.

I was drafted onto that committee for a short period of time and rushed for the exit. I have never pretended to understand the process, certainly not to the extent that Senator DOMENICI understands it. So I really need some help here.

Mr. President, the debate is: How are we going to spend the peace dividend? We all know that this wonderful revenue stream is going to be coming our way, and now is the time for us to make the big decisions on the floor of the Senate on how to spend it.

Senator DOMENICI says, "Well, maybe it is premature to start cutting up the pie. Education, children's issues, maybe should be considered, but there might be other concerns for how to spend the peace dividend. So let us reserve judgment on how we spend this wonderful fund that is coming our way."

My question—and I apologize for my ignorance in even asking it—but my question is: What peace dividend? What fund of money? Where is this thing that is coming our way?

And the basis of my question is this: From everything I have read, trying to ascertain what the various candidates are saying up in New Hampshire, the most far out, let us say generous version, of the peace dividend is that we should cut defense spending by 50 percent—50.

Right now, we are spending, roughly, I think, $300 billion on national defense. So if you assume the most draconian cut of national defense, 50 percent—more than the majority leader is suggesting—that is $150 billion a year cut in defense spending.

According to the Congressional Budget Office, in a report issued this month, report to Congress, the Federal Government's spending in 1992—Federal Government spending—on Medicaid and Medicare combined is $196 billion this year. By 1997, the Federal Government will be spending in constant dollars on Medicare and Medicaid $344 billion. That is an increase in constant dollars of $148 billion in a 5-year period of time on Medicare and Medicaid alone.

Mr. President, I might say that these numbers—$148 billion increase in Medicare and Medicaid—are without any consideration of any health care legislation that we might pass. And that is the big issue. I mean, people are getting elected to the U.S. Senate saying we need to do more on health care. Bills are being reported out of committees saying we are not doing nearly enough in health care; we must do more. We must expand what we are doing in health care. But if we do nothing, nothing, nothing in health care, the cost to the Federal Government alone in Medicare and Medicaid alone increases over 5 years by $148 billion.

My question to the ranking member of the Budget Committee is simply this: Please explain to me where the pot of money is. Where is it the peace dividend? It would seem to me that if the most we are going to cut military spending is $150 billion a year and if health care costs to the Government alone are going up by $148 billion a year, the very most we can have by way of a peace dividend is $2 billion.

Have I missed something?

Mr. DOMENICI. This is all charged to the Senator from New Mexico.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Let me say that other than my colleague saying these numbers were per year—and they are for 5 years—he has not missed a thing.

We have a tendency here in the Senate and the Congress to talk about what happens to the fiscal policy of our Nation as if there were just two categories: defense and everything else. Often, some assume that savings in defense are really savings that we can spend somewhere else ignoring other parts of the budget. We ignore that perhaps spending on Medicare and Medicaid is going up more than the entire savings assumed from defense. We just discount increases to health costs and say that health is an entitlement. And, so, increased spending on health does not count.

Let me assure the Senator, if he is worried about getting the Federal deficit under control, spending on health care counts. Every single penny counts just as the burden we put on the shoulders of the American people with our enormous deficit counts.

What we will do, if we dedicate every bit of defense spending to spending on other programs is ignore the deficit and its burden. We will also have committed ourselves to never getting the deficit under control unless—and I will give you a couple of "unlesses"—we pursue other options.

For instance, if you want, in a couple of years, you can tax the American people across the board 20 percent, raise everything 20 percent. With this option, you might get the budget under control. You might.

If you do not have other options, you will have a deficit of between $200 and $325 billion just rocking along. This deficit will add to America's inability to save. This deficit will add to an inability to compete globally because American companies, large and small, do not have capital available to compete. And we will just add to the deficit, ridding ourselves of all sense of responsibility, as I see it.

Let me also suggest to my colleage that perhaps $150 billion is draconian. Nobody is seriously suggesting $150 billion. There are some suggesting $100 billion, some suggesting $90 billion, and I must admit there are some saying we can achieve $135 billion in defense cuts.

So I think the answer to the Senator's question is quite obvious: There really is no peace dividend. If you look at the effect of the automatic growth in entitlement programs, programs that are growing on their own, such as health, any defense savings will be eaten and gobbled up faster than you can see.

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I might just add to what the Senator from New Mexico has said. I am a politician. I like to make people happy. And I think there is a tried and true way to make people happy, and that is to say: We are going to give you some more money. We are going to be spending more money; does that not make you happy? And if we spend enough, may we please have your vote?

So, I think that is just excellent politicking, and I hate to be the kind of person who puts a damper on this and who says there is not any money.

It is my understanding that this year, Medicare and Medicaid is $196 billion. And in 1997, with no program changes, it is $344 billion. That is a $148 billion increase.

If that is true, no conceivable peace dividend equals that.

It seems to me, maybe we should give some thought to the cost of health care in this country. Maybe we should give just a little bit of thought to the increased cost of health care to the country as a whole, and to the increased cost of health care to the Federal Government—what the bill is going to be, before we start spending this wonderful revenue flow that is going to be coming our way.

I know the former Senator from Minnesota, Senator Humphrey, called it the politics of joy. And it is, It is joyous—joyous—to tell people that we have wonderful ideas of how we are going to have huge increases in Government spending.

I do not want to be the person who is dampening this joy. But it seems to me that maybe the question should be raised, Where is this peace dividend? The Senator from Missouri does not see it.

I thank the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, how much time have I used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has 42 minutes 33 seconds remaining.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I want to yield myself 2 minutes, and then we will go back to Senator WIRTH. I have two additional speakers, I might say to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. President, I want to add to what my good friend from Missouri said about "What peace dividend?" I would just add a thought.

First, I will put in the RECORD an entire list of programs of the Federal Government that I believe are for children, from Head Start to many others. I believe the increases over the decade of the eighties are far more than the 5 percent alleged in the Wirth resolution.

But having made that point, let me suggest to the Senate, nothing—let me repeat nothing—would be better for the children of the United States of America than for us to find a way to rid ourselves of the deficit, when we rid ourselves of the deficit, the American economy can grow and prosper at sustained rates. Our standard of living will increase from generation to generation, as was the case in the early days of our industrialization. Nothing could be better for children, than us reducing the deficit and our debt. Nothing is more important to our Nation's children than getting the deficit under control.

As the Senator from Missouri points out, you will never get the deficit under control if you allocate the entire peace dividend to more spending, and then turn other programs into uncontrollable entitlements. As has been suggested by the resolution by Senators WIRTH and WELLSTONE.

I just believe children will be better off if we do not spend more. They will be better off if we fix the economy by fixing the deficit.

I ask unanimous consent that a table displaying funding increases for children be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL FUNDING OF CHILDREN'S PROGRAMS—CHANGE FROM 1980 TO 1990

[Nominal dollars in millions]

	1980	1990	Change	
			Dollars	Percent
Health:				
Medicaid	2,910	8,200	5,290	181.8
Maternal and child health	424	554	130	30.7
Community/migrant health	298	506	208	69.8
Homeless health care	0	36	36	N/A
Immunizations	0	187	187	N/A
Subtotal, health	3,632	9,483	5,851	161.1
Cash:				
AFDC	6,924	12,246	5,322	76.9
Supplemental security income	5,716	11,493	5,777	101.1
Earned income tax credit	1,275	4,354	3,079	241.5
Refugee assistance	383	558	175	45.7
Foster care/ad asst	263	1,579	1,316	500.4
Subtotal, cash	14,561	30,230	15,669	107.6
Food:				
Food stamps	9,117	14,992	5,875	64.4
Child nutrition	3,536	4,996	1,460	41.3
WIC and CSFP	717	2,196	1,479	206.3
TEFAP	0	169	169	N/A
Subtotal, food	13,370	22,353	8,983	67.2
Housing:				
Public Housing Op Subs	1,070	1,805	735	68.7
Housing payments	5,746	7,299	1,553	27.0
Emergency shelter grants	0	47	47	N/A
Supportive housing	0	58	58	N/A
Subtotal, housing	6,816	9,209	2,393	35.1
Ed/social services:				
Head Start	736	1,447	711	96.6
Follow Through	44	7	(37)	−84.1
Chapter One	3,197	5,368	2,171	67.9
Handicapped Education	1,049	2,055	1,006	95.9
Math and Science Grants	0	159	159	N/A
Drug Free Schools	0	539	539	N/A
Education of Homeless	0	7	7	N/A
Dropout Prevention	0	20	20	N/A
HDS/Children, Youth, Families	57	424	367	643.9
Vocational Ed	979	950	(29)	−3.0
WIN	396	5	(391)	−98.7
Youth Training/Job Corps	2,330	1,484	(846)	−36.3
CETA	3,342	0	(3,342)	−100.0
JTPA	0	1,745	1,745	N/A
Title XX SSBG	2,635	2,776	131	5.0
Community Services	493	389	(104	−21.1
Emer. Food and Shelter	0	132	132	N/A
LIHEAP	1,577	1,314	(263)	−16.7
Weatherization	182	162	(20)	−11.0
Child Care Block Grant	0	772	772	N/A
Subtotal, Ed/soc ser	17,017	19,745	2,728	16.0
Subtotals:				
Health programs	3,632	9,483	5,851	161.1
Cash assistance	14,561	30,230	15,669	107.6
Food	13,370	22,353	8,983	67.2
Housing	6,816	9,209	2,393	35.1
Ed/social services	17,017	19,745	2,728	16.0
Total, children	55,396	91,020	35,624	64.3

Prepared by SBC Minority Staff 1–26–92.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute, and then I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. President, this is not about robbing Peter to pay Paul in an attempt to get Paul's vote. That is a very superficial, it seems to me—very superficial—discussion of what is a fundamental request and plea for change. Some of us have for a long time believed that our national defense should be described in terms very different from building more missiles and more tanks designed for an enemy which really no longer exists. It is important to have a strong defense, but not one that is gold-plated; not one of excess as has happened in the past.

The American public is now saying: Let us not even get into that debate. Let us just make some significant changes. They know they have to be made. One of those sets of changes has to be the investment in young people, in the future. Another set of those changes has to be the control of health care costs, which I think many of us have been advocating, a dramatic and quite almost radical change in our health care system, for the purposes of getting costs under control and getting more reasonable coverage for all people of this Nation.

That is what the American public is asking. This is not robbing Peter to pay Paul. This is, are we going to be willing to start now with the sort of change I believe we are expected to make and are elected to make? We have an obligation to the American people to come out to them and say we are here to make those changes, and not go along with business as usual; or go along with assumptions as usual.

Mr. President, I yield 12 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Colorado.

I was listening to the comments of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, as well as the distinguished Senator from Missouri. And as I listened to what they were saying, I felt that the critique that they were presenting was a very important critique. Except the problem was they were critiquing an amendment which does not exist.

This is the age-old debate tactic of lifting up a straw man or straw woman and then tearing it down.

Let me just be very clear about what this amendment says and what it does not say. It says:

> Legislation should be enacted that realigns the 1990 budget agreement to reflect the true priorities of the American people by shifting unnecessary—

It contains no specific figure. It continues:

> military spending into domestic programs, including child development, education, and job training, to promote the Nation's long-term economic growth and social well-being.

That is not an exclusive list. There is nothing in this amendment that says that when we decide to bring the budget wall down, and how we are going to transfer resources, that all those resources have to go to children or education. It does not say that. I would challenge my friends on the other side of the aisle to find any such wording here in this amendment.

The Senator from Missouri raised some interesting questions about health care. Senator KENNEDY is here on the floor and can answer questions about health care. I suppose—in fact, it is more than I suppose—I know we will have a vital debate about health care. That is going to be a crucial issue for our country. But for now, let me get back to what this amendment is about.

We do not say that all money, whatever we eventually decide—this is only a sense-of-the-Senate amendment—all has to go to education. We do not say some of it cannot go to deficit reduction. We do not say that some of it should not go to physical infrastructure. I think it should. There are some who think it should go to tax cuts. We could agree or disagree. None of that is excluded in this amendment.

I will tell my colleagues what this amendment says. It says what I heard almost every single Senator on this floor say over the last several weeks. I have said it before, but I have to say it one more time.

Every politician is for children and education except when it comes to digging into the pockets. All this says is we know we have not done enough; we know the real national security of this country is going to be when we invest in the health, skill, intellect, and character of our young people. We know we have to do much more for education. And we make a commitment to eventually, when we bring down the wall, to making sure that we transfer some resources to our children and education. That is all this amendment says.

Yesterday, I met with Alice Dillon of the PICA Program, Parents In Community Action, of south Minneapolis—a Head Start Program, Senator KENNEDY, for 120 homeless children.

Every one of those children, every one of those boys and girls, you look into their eyes, and each one of them has the potential to go out into this world and make something beautiful happen if we provide them with the support. What Head Start says is that we as a people are going to provide children from the toughest circumstances with just that, Head Start—and we are funding it at a 28-percent level? All this amendment says is that we are going to do better. We can be better. That is all this amendment says.

I read:

> In Landsdowne Junior High School, the St. Louis Sun reports, "there are scores of window frames without glass, like sockets without eyes." Hallways in many schools are dark, with light bulbs missing or burnt out. One walks into a school, a member of the city's board of education notes, and you can smell the urinals 100 feet away. A teacher in an elementary school in East St. Louis has only one full-color workbook for her class, one. She photocopies workbook pages for her children, but the copies cannot be made in color and the lessons call for color recognition by the children. A history teacher at the Martin Luther King, school has 110 students in four classes—but only 26 books.

I could go on and on and on.

We know that there are things that work, such as making sure every woman expecting a child has a diet full of vitamins and protein, but we do not fully support that program; or making sure children have a nurturing, sup-

porting environment so by the time they get to kindergarten they have a real chance, but we do not fully support that program. The Head Start Program has been an unambiguous success for almost three decades, and we are funding it at the 28-percent level.

And then there is this question that Senator WIRTH raised about all the young people who finally do graduate from school, although many are doomed to unequal lives right now. What happens with job training? How do they obtain jobs? How do they make the transition to the work force? I hear about that all the time, but we are not funding those programs.

And, finally, Senator WIRTH, Democrats, my friends on the other side of the aisle, how many Senators have I heard talk about the importance of each and every young person having the opportunity to pursue his or her higher education and making sure that young people can afford it?

This amendment just says we can do much better. That is all it says. It is nonbinding. There is no specific figure. It certainly is not just exclusively about education, but it certainly seemed appropriate as a sense-of-the-Senate amendment to an education bill to signal to the people in this country that we know what we have to do and, when that budget wall is eliminated, surely some of the resources will go to the education of our young people.

Mr. President, let me conclude this way. I said it on Friday and I am going to say it again. There is an old Yiddish proverb which says you cannot dance at two weddings at the same time. I think that is what too many Senators have been doing when it comes to children and education. This amendment enables Senators in this Chamber to make it clear to young people, to educators, to parents, and to communities that we know we can do much better and, indeed, we will do that.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Minnesota whether or not Senator WIRTH's and his amendment implies that military savings should not be used for middle-income tax cuts, deficit reduction, or other purposes?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I will answer the Senator from Texas by stating that the amendment does not address the question of deficit reduction or middle-income tax cuts. However, I assure the Senator that this amendment does not imply that the reduction in defense spending must be used exclusively for education. In particular, it does not imply that the revenue saved from a reduction in defense expenditures may not be used to finance middle-income tax cuts or deficit reduction.

Mr. BENTSEN. Then do I assume correctly that the Senator's amendment does not intend to minimize the merits of a middle-income tax cut and deficit reduction as means to promote, as it says in the amendment, "the long term economic growth and social well being"?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I will say to my good friend from Texas that his assumption is correct, with respect to the intent of this amendment. We are simply focusing today on the subject of education.

Mr. BENTSEN. I thank my good friend for answering my questions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield the floor?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I do yield the floor.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, I yield myself 6 minutes.

Mr. President, we all care about education. The reason I believe the question of the Senator from Colorado has become contentious is that it is more than just a simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I would like to talk about the specifics of this sense-of-the-Senate resolution. If one is going to vote for this sense-of-the-Senate resolution, they also are going on record as supporting two new entitlement programs, one of them being Head Start. I care deeply about Head Start, but Head Start funding has doubled since President Bush took office in January 1989, going from $1.235 billion to a proposed 1993 spending of $2.8 billion for full funding for all 4-year-olds who are eligible for Head Start.

We all support that. But there is a certain amount of absorption that has to come in making Head Start an entitlement, along with an entitlement for the Pell grant, which is a grant for eligible students in higher education. A Pell grant entitlement would immediately take it from about $5 billion today to $11 billion. I personally feel strongly, Mr. President, that both of those programs are far better dealt with under the authorization and appropriation process that we have today rather than an automatic entitlement.

I would just like to go through some of the other things that are listed in the sense-of-the-Senate resolution. One of them is an investment in elementary and secondary education to improve educational achievement. Mr. President, I thought that is what we were doing with S. 2. I believe we have spoken to some very innovative programs at a funding level that is going to be almost an additional $1 billion for elementary and secondary education. With this bill, we are moving the Federal Government in a rather dramatic way into new and innovative programs in elementary and secondary education.

Also listed here is an effort to reduce classroom size and promote equity. None of us could disagree with that, but I think that expressing this in a sense-of-the-Senate resolution does not really do much.

Third, an investment in school-to-work transition initiatives is listed. I think we all agree that is very important. However, we addressed that just last year when we reauthorized the Carl Perkins bill, the vocational technical legislation in which we had tech prep language. Perhaps we did not go as far as some would wish, but I think that we expanded that initiative to a very important degree.

I myself do not wish to make the Pell grant an entitlement. I think we could appropriate to the full amount that has been authorized and expand the Pell Grant Program, but to make it an entitlement, takes it in a direction that we question.

So this is more than just a simple sense-of-the-Senate resolution, Mr. President. I think when we talk about the peace dividend, we should not be designing sense-of-the-Senate resolutions which really do no more than just say we are for education. We are laying out initiatives on this which will be debated at a later point and I think they require very thoughtful debate.

We all are going to be debating health care in the future and the moneys that we are going to need for different initiatives regarding health care.

We are all concerned with the environment, and certainly the Senator from Colorado has been a key leader in environmental issues, with the moneys we would like to see utilized in environmental issues. But I think, Mr. President, it is a serious mistake to view this as just something lightly; to be taken as a vote of our interest in education. It is more than that. I think we do a disservice to the important issues involved in this sense-of-the-Senate resolution to treat it too lightly. And for that reason, Mr. President, I think this should be rejected.

I yield the floor and yield back any additional time I may have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I yield back to the Senator from New Mexico any time I have left.

Mr. DOMENICI. The Senator wants to yield whatever time she did not use to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Yes. I yield that time to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts such time as he may need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I commend my friends, the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH], Senator WELLSTONE, and others for bringing this measure before the Senate this afternoon. I hope very much that their amendment, of which I am a cosponsor, will be supported.

Mr. President, it is appropriate that we have the debate and discussion this afternoon, when the President of the United States will be addressing this Nation about how best to deal with the problems we are facing with our economy and also will be making recommendations with regards to education programs, health programs, and others. We have an opportunity this afternoon to speak to the issue of education. That is really what this amendment is about. It is an opportunity to send a signal about priorities of this body on the issue of education. I believe Senator WIRTH and Senator WELLSTONE have outlined well what is in this amendment and what is not.

It is an important vote. We will have opportunities later in the session to vote on specifics such as the appropriations bills, and budget considerations. But nonetheless, this really is the first opportunity this body has to go on record since we effectively recessed a number of weeks ago.

All of us have had an opportunity during that period of time to go back to our States, to listen to people, to talk to parents, to speak to teachers, school administrators, and superintendents and hear and see for ourselves the very extraordinary challenge that exists for our Nation in trying to assure that we are going to have an educated population. I think the design and scope of this amendment gives emphasis to the school readiness programs, and elementary, secondary education. Sure, we will provide some resources to our 80,000 school districts, but we all recognize we are still talking only of a fraction of those school districts that otherwise may be able, with additional funding, to take advantage of that creativity which we talked about last week.

We know the importance of moving from school to work and of higher education. We know what has happened to higher education. We hear the comment, well, do we really want to go ahead and have an entitlement for higher education. I say yes. We have 68 other entitlement programs. I say yes.

That is not the issue. We talk now about a semi-entitlement in education because it really depends on the appropriation for Pell grants, how much will be appropriated, versus how much is authorized. If funds are available, students have a right to get a loan for their education.

But, Mr. President, let us back up a step. Over the last 25 years that I have been in the Senate, we have expressed our priorities on a variety of different issues that we thought were important. In the last 3 or 4 years we have said OK, we will spend billions of dollars, tens of billions of dollars to save our savings and loans. That is enormously important—threatening our banking system. That is important.

We have seen the expansion of FDIC, billions of dollars, tens of billions of dollars, to make sure our banking structure is going to continue to be an essential element in terms of our commercial opportunities and strength.

I was here in the 1960's and 1970's when we said we do not have the resources to bail out Lockheed, one of the important manufacturers of airframes and airplanes. But we said that is important, Lockheed is important. It is important to our national security. It is important to our national defense. The vote here was virtually decided by one or two votes, but we voted on that issue. We were not subject at that time to a technicality.

We all understand the technicality of waiving the Budget Act, but I would say that is limited probably to this building. People talk about the relevancy of this institution and the difficulty of identifying with the problems that are facing working families. These issues will be raised this afternoon when due to a technicality to the budget waiver, we may preclude an opportunity for this amendment to be successful, a technicality. We are restricted by those rules.

People across this country want action on the economy, on education, and on health care. This is our first opportunity to express it in a sense-of-the-Senate, understanding, as these Senators do, that we are going to have to go through the budget resolution, and review it in terms of our peace dividend.

It may be difficult for some people to understand where this peace dividend is. Last year we spent $140 billion of our taxpayers' money to defend Western Europe against the Warsaw Pact. The Warsaw Pact has disappeared. There has to be something there. There has to be some resources there to be invested in America. There is reluctance and resistance to support potential growth in various Medicaid programs, growth which is going to take place in the late 1990's. Nevertheless we are going to have to come to grips with those programs.

Are we going to say we are going to let those grow and eat up all the resources? Of course we are not. What about the billions we spent in Southeast Asia last year? Nothing. There must be billions out there to identify with the education of our young people. This amendment does not say precisely $10 billion, $15 billion, but it says that this is going to be a priority. It is going to be an important priority.

We said in the 1970's that we were going to save Lockheed. That it was a priority. We said it with regards to Chrysler. That was a priority too: tens of thousands of workers, an important manufacturer, and automobiles in this country. Let us do that. We said it with regard to New York City. We are going to help in the refinancing of New York City. That was a priority. We said it with regards to Penn Central Railroad. That is a priority. Look how important that railroad is to Pennsylvania and the Northeast and other parts of the country. All those are priorities.

Now are we going to say children are a priority, education is a priority?

Well, we said OK; Lockheed, and Chrysler, they paid us back. We know that the investment in Head Start Programs, in early education programs, in the WIC Programs, immunization, paid back more times than what was paid in.

We had a priority to go into Kuwait. We differed about the amount of $55 billion but we were not talking about whether we were going to find that money. We were not talking about Medicaid, at that time, escalations down the line. We said that is a priority, and they are going to do it. The Nation is going to do it. Fortunately we have gotten repaid on some of that investment. We were not debating that issue prior to the time the servicemen went across that border. That was a priority.

We have found the willingness as an institution to say what are our priorities. That is what this amendment is about. This amendment is about that.

It is a recognition that for the last 40 years we have robbed education from the young people, robbed decent health care from our people. A dramatic reduction of the discretionary budget over the last 10 or 15 years, virtually cut in half, to do what? To build security in our national defense.

It has worked. We are saying with the Russians not walking to the door, running to the door, that there must be some savings. And we are saying on the first major legislative proposal that we place a priority in terms of the education of the young. We have been all too willing to do that, Mr. President, at other times in important measures. We have an opportunity to do it this afternoon.

I would hope that our colleagues would be able to express their sense of priorities on investing here at home in America, in children, in those that are attending the early elementary, secondary schools; those that are moving from schools to work; those that are struggling to finance a college education—the sons and daughters of working families, and our graduate students as well. All of our students should be able to at least know that this institution recognizes the importance of that kind of investment for our Nation.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. How much time do we have?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico controls 35 minutes 22 seconds, and the other side 31 minutes 56 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I only have one additional speaker. He will arrive shortly. Then I will speak for 3 or 4 minutes. Then if they are ready we will yield back the time. I will save it now and await the Senator from Texas who is arriving shortly.

Mr. WIRTH. I yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I rise in strong support of this. We made a mistake on the budget agreement in agreeing that we would have a 60-percent firewall there on the defense budget side of this—unprecedented.

And if some of you will recall the night that we passed the budget agreement I had an amendment here that was adopted by a voice vote in the Senate saying, let us cut back the 60 percent to a simple majority. Because if we want to shift funds from whatever area into whatever other area, we ought to be able to do that with a simple majority.

This goes beyond that and says we have to make a priority out of education. One of the great deficiencies of this Government, not just to this Government, of our whole system, is that we are doing too much short-term thinking, and not enough long-term thinking.

I recently had the opportunity to read the rough draft of a manuscript that will be out in a few months by Lester Thurow, the distinguished MIT economist. He quotes a Swedish institute that does evaluations of businesses around the world, 28 countries. And in most categories the United States was one of the top 10. In no category as I recall were we No. 1.

But then it came down to long-term planning, and, in long-term planning, corporations in the United States were 27th out of 28. Only Hungary was behind us.

And what is true of corporate America, which is worried about the quarterly report, the annual stockholders meeting, is also true of the public sector. We do far too little long-term planning.

Sunday's New York Times has a story about productivity in the United States and some other countries, comparing growth from the year 1975 to the year 1988. I do not remember all of the figures, but I remember these four. The United States experienced 12 percent productivity growth in those 13 years; Great Britain, 33 percent; France, 34 percent; Japan, 58 percent. You do not have to be a Rhodes scholar to understand that means we are drifting in the wrong direction, and what turns us around is who invests in our people.

Economists do not agree on very much but one thing they do agree on, and that is you are going to compete with the rest of the world either through lower wages or increased skills. Those are our choices. Basically, we have followed a low-wage pattern. That is why several industrial countries now have higher average per-hour industrial wages than we do in our country.

What we have to do is to invest in our human resources. This suggests that we do so in concrete terms.

All kinds of things could be used as illustrations. The GI bill, and, if the Presiding Officer will forgive me, I think he is old enough to remember when we had the GI bill after World War II. If you take that old GI bill, which was conceived as a gift to veterans, and put an index on it, inflation index, that would average today $8,100 in a grant regardless of income. We thought of it as a gift to veterans. It turned out to be an investment in our own prosperity.

We ought to be doing much more for those who want to go on to college.

In the area of elementary and secondary schools, of the 18 OECD nations, we are 14th in what we invest. We are great on the bites, on the speeches about education, but in substance we are slipping sadly.

I cheered along with everyone else when the President said it, I think it was a State of the Union Message, when he said, "By the end of this century I want American students to be No. 1 in math and science." The realities, my friend, if we do not change our priorities we will be very lucky to hold on to where we are and not slip further. That is the reality.

We are going to have to look at things that pay off in terms of long-term investments. Education is one of those things. We need everything from Head Start down to, at the beginning, to Adult Start, or Slow Start, or whatever you want to call it, to training people once they are workers.

No nation on the face of the Earth, no industrial nation, spends as little on training and retraining workers once they are in the labor force as we do. We just cannot continue that. We have to do better. And this resolution which is not binding——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. SIMON. If I could have 30 more seconds?

Mr. WIRTH. I yield 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SIMON. I will not, believe it or not, use 2 additional minutes.

We have a chance here to adopt a nonbinding resolution that suggests that we ought to make the priority out of education. I think that is the least that we ought to do. I strongly support the resolution.

I yield back the remainder of my time to the supporters of the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WIRTH. How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado controls 25 minutes and 16 seconds.

Mr. WIRTH. The Senator from New Mexico?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico controls 35 minutes and 6 seconds.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield off mine, as he has.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico has yielded back to 25 minutes and 8 seconds.

Mr. WIRTH. I yield 6 minutes to the Senator from Minnesota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, let me, first of all, thank the Senator from Illinois for his remarks. I want to, once again, make a case for what this sense-of-the-Senate amendment is about, and then I want to go back to what I fear is the politics of what is being played out here on the floor, just to be very clear about it.

First of all, when it comes to the "why" of education, I do not think it is possible to divorce education from what we have to do both to have a short-run stimulus to our economy or, for that matter, for long-term productivity.

I said the other day on the floor of the Senate—and I think there is a fair amount of agreement about this, even if maybe later on we do not all agree—that politics has become very concrete in our country, very concrete. These bread-and-butter economic issues have walked into people's homes and are staring them in the face. And there is a tremendous sense of foreboding about the future for our country. And I think the vast majority of people in the United States of America know that at least part of the definition of national strength will be whether or not we can compete economically in this next decade, much less the next century, and that part of the way in which we will be able to compete is if we have a literate, productive, highly educated, highly skilled work force; that is to say, a work force that can provide high-value labor to produce high-value products.

So when Senator WIRTH and I proposed this sense-of-the-Senate amendment, which, once again, only says that when the budget wall comes down, some resources must be devoted to this human capital, does not say that human resources cannot be devoted to a lot of other decisive areas. It just says we have to make some of this shift.

We are talking about whether or not we can compete economically as a nation.

My other point—because it has not been mentioned today, and I believe that Senator KASSEBAUM and I are probably in agreement on this, although we may disagree about how to get there—is that it is absolutely essential—John Dewey said it best of all—to have young people later on be-

coming adult citizens who can think on their own two feet in a democracy. And any society that does not invest in education is a society that is in danger of losing its capacity for self-government.

So, again, I proposed this amendment with Senator WIRTH—and there is a lot of support from other Senators as well—because of my background in education.

I am here on the floor of the Senate. We are about to pass a good education bill. But most of us know it is not near enough. I have heard my colleagues on both sides say that we have to do more, and that is all this sense-of-the-Senate says.

I do not understand what people are so frightened about. I really do not understand what people are so frightened about. If Senator X, Y, Z, O, or whatever, from whatever States, without using names, is on the floor saying that we have to make this kind of commitment, why in the world would anybody vote against a resolution that just says we need to begin to make this kind of commitment?

I also want to emphasize one more time, Mr. President, that in my conversation with the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN] he raised an important question, and I think an important question for other Senators as well, once again: Is there anything in the sense-of-the-Senate amendment which precludes any money that might be generated from some reductions in the military budget to go into deficit reduction, tax cuts, public infrastructure investment? One more time: Absolutely not.

Let us be clear one more time that this is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that puts the Senate on record as saying we know we can do better for education and young people. I would think there would be almost unanimous support for such a sense-of-the-Senate amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. WIRTH. I yield myself 30 seconds. I have two other Senators who have expressed a desire to be here to speak on the issue. And the Senator had others?

Mr. DOMENICI. Just Senator GRAMM. And I was going to try to cut mine back to something that would reduce the time.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I yield myself whatever time I may consume, as we are waiting for the other Senators to come.

Mr. President, I really do not understand, and Senator WELLSTONE does not understand, what the enormous opposition to this is. As far as I have heard in the Senate for the last 5 years, every Member of the Senate has gotten up and spoken about the virtues of education, spoken about the priority of education, spoken about the importance of education, spoken about the fact that we have to put greater long-term priority on education. Everybody has said that.

Now is a chance to simply say in a resolution that this is of a great import to the U.S. Senate. I myself would go a lot further than that. I would go a lot further in the appropriations process and in the budget process and say that a great deal of the dividend that we are going to reap as a result of changing our national priorities on expenditure ought to go to education. We are currently spending $290 billion a year, Mr. President, on defense, $290 billion a year.

The peacetime norm, average, since World War II, is $235 billion a year. That is at the height of the cold war. What are we spending today? We are spending $55 billion a year more than we were at the height of the cold war; $55 billion a year more in 1991 dollars.

We say we are not going to have any cutbacks of that? Of course, we are. All of the budget plans I have seen outlined call for significant cuts in the defense area. Of course, we are. We are going to do that, and the American people are asking us to do that, telling us to do that, and saying that the world has changed. And it has, profoundly so.

Maybe there is a lot of fear rolling around of this change. People are often made very uncomfortable and fearful of the unknown, and we are going into the unknown, Mr. President. There is no question about it. We are moving into relatively uncharted waters. We are the only superpower left. We no longer have that defining relationship with the Soviet Union to tell us what we ought to spend our money on.

The world is more complex than it used to be. Our trade situation has changed; the need for us to be more competitive in the world has changed. These are all unknowns and sometimes a very fear-inductive phenomenon. For people in all of our States, change is coming, too.

I spoke this morning with employees from the Rocky Flats nuclear weapons plant in Denver, which is going to stop production as a nuclear weapons plant. That is going to mean some cutbacks and adjustments. Instead of saying, "No, no, do not change," we have to say, OK, that change has come about. The cold war is over.

That is a metaphor for a lot of other changes that will occur. And are we going to be willing to make those changes and face up to them modestly, or are we going to run away from them? We cannot run away. I think much of the country thinks we run away from too much of this as it is—and I think they are probably right—trying to duck the difficult issues and the tough questions that have to be raised.

The people in my State feel this way, and we do not have to run on this "rob Peter to pay Paul," as suggested earlier, "They are taking money out of one pocket to go to the other." That is not the case.

These votes should not be votes of politics. If that were the case, Mr. President, I would have stood up and said, only for political purposes, that what we ought to be doing is spending an enormous amount of money to deploy the Strategic Defense Initiative, which could affect vast numbers of potential jobs in Colorado. The political thing to do is I should have voted for it. But I did not think we ought to deploy it. I did not think that was right.

We have to make those choices, and we are being asked by the public to do so, and it is about time we did. This resolution is a first step in that direction. Is there going to be change? It is going to happen. If so, how are we going to redirect those resources?

Again, if I had my druthers, the No. 1 priority would be kids and education. Both investments in education and in overall health care programs, are the kind of long-term investment that is absolutely imperative for us to make.

We know how cost effective prenatal care is and what happens on the immunization programs and how inexpensive they are. These are the best investments you can make. We have had 25-plus years of success in the Head Start Program.

And even though there have been some modest increases in the last 2 years, over the last 10 years we have seen a sharp and relative decline, only a quarter of the Head-Start-eligible kids enrolled, when that is the best educational investment we can make. Disgraceful.

We know that we have to do a lot of work on retraining teachers, these people who are working, killing themselves out there day in and day out, in some of the toughest places in the United States, in some of the toughest jobs. What we ought to be doing is what we did in the sixties and seventies. We ought to have summer training programs for all those children; help them reinvigorate themselves, recharge themselves, learn new techniques, new skills. We ought to be rewarding them for being in the classroom, not punishing them. We know how to do that. With a relatively small investment, you get a tremendous return.

We have to be doing a lot more on higher education and student access, which we discussed a little earlier. Higher education is becoming a privilege of people who have more money. We have to include that opportunity for all Americans, and it is out of the reach of too darned many.

We know that we need massive changes in the area of research and development. We used to have this wonderful economic machine, which was a cooperative effort among our univer-

sities and the private sector and the Government. Route 128 in Boston is a beautiful example of that. Stanford Industrial Park. What is going on in the Front Range of Colorado, and Golden Triangle in North Carolina is another example of cooperation as to institutions of education, the private sector, and the Government all working together. That was a mammoth engine of economic change, and we have let it corrode over the last decade.

And the money that we are spending on civilian research and development has declined dramatically. The Government's share declined; the private sector share, which has always reflected that, declined as well, just as the Germans and the Japanese are going in the opposite direction.

These are the kinds of things that should be at the top of our priority list. They should be at the top. What this amendment says is that we believe that education and our future is a priority that ought to be recognized. I put it right at the top, in an absolute sense. We do not have that opportunity now, nor is that what this resolution is all about. This resolution is all about setting priorities, and what is important.

Mr. President, why in the world we would have such controversy over something that is as straightforward as this proposal, I do not understand. Why in the world everybody here is not willing to put their vote where their priorities have been, and where their statements have been, as we make these changes, which are going to occur, our priorities ought to go to education, I do not know.

But, Mr. President, we have a few minutes of debate remaining. I would, at this point, retain my time, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

Mr. GRAHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LIEBERMAN). The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield for two questions?

Mr. WIRTH. I am happy to yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I have been listening to this debate, and I am concerned about what is it we are committing to with this resolution. I am looking specifically at the second-degree amendment, which is the pending question, on page 6, line 6, which states that:

> It is the sense of the Senate that . . . the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 should be amended to permit the realization of a new domestic order through—

And then it lists (A), (B), (C), and (D) as items to be accomplished, which are quite specific. For instance, (A), Investments that ensure that all eligible 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old children receive comprehensive Head Start services. That sounds like an entitlement program for Head Start. Is that what is intended?

Mr. WIRTH. It is not, Mr. President. First of all, we had to include the Congressional Budget Act in there because that is the reference point to the 1990 agreement. That is why that is in there.

Second, this is not by any means—and we discussed this earlier—an entitlement program either for Head Start or for higher education, and, in fact, the resolution refers to the appropriated program we have today. As much as I would like to see us fully fund the Head Start Program, this is a sense-of-the-Senate, and it just says investments that ensure that all eligible children receive these services.

> It is the sense of the Senate that legislation should be enacted to provide investments that ensure that all eligible children are enrolled.

That is the sequence of the language.

Mr. GRAHAM. In (B), it talks about that it should be amended—

> to permit the realization of new domestic order through
>
> (B) investments that ensure that elementary and secondary schools have financial assistance necessary to improve educational achievement, promote student participation, and provide an educational environment that is conducive to learning, including a constructive student-teacher ratio.

Again, what action is intended to be generated as a result of the adoption of this sense-of-the-Senate with that language?

Mr. WIRTH. These are only examples of the kinds of things that ought to be done, as in the proceeding, at the top of page 6, that what we want to be doing is promoting the Nation's long-term economic growth and social well-being. Those are the kinds of things, as it says up here, that should be included in such an effort. Not exclusive by any means, but the kinds of things that we ought to do.

Mr. GRAHAM. Is there an estimate of what the range of financial costs would be in order to accomplish these objectives?

Mr. WIRTH. This is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution. It is not something that says how much money is involved in this at all. We are going to get to that point when we get to the budget resolution and as we go through the appropriations process. All this is a sense-of-the-Senate that says these items are a priority for us in the United States. And that priority, then, if you believe in that priority, these are the kinds of things that ought to be included in it.

Mr. GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am going to yield 10 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Texas, but I want to make this remark.

Frankly, on the other side of the aisle, it seems to me they are having difficulty because they do not know which side of the mouth to talk out of.

On the one hand, this resolution is meaningless. As a matter of fact, some who support it are saying: Any Senator that wants to spend a peace dividend for anything other than the programs proposed here should just come down to the Senate Chamber and we will put a colloquy together that says it is all right to spend more on a favorite program. So really, the resolution is meaningless.

On the other hand, my friends are arguing that we are in desperate shape in certain areas as a nation, and that we ought to spend money in a certain way because they are the highest priority. A simple way to resolve this conflict is to go ahead and amend this resolution to add all the other programs and activities that are a national priority. Everything is a high priority.

Education is a high priority. On the other hand, some say for continued economic growth we have to reduce taxes. That is a high priority. Some say infrastructure is a high priority.

Frankly, this resolution either means something or it does not. I am of the opinion that those who are offering it want to tell people that they are for these national priorities, so how can they then say the resolution is meaningless?

You know, the American people are listening to this debate. The few thousand that stay awake to listen to it, must be chuckling about Senators here on the floor talking about how we are going to fix productivity in America with this resolution. Especially when other Senators up and say the resolution does not mean anything.

Frankly, I am of the opinion that we do not need the kind of advice offered by this resolution for the next year. We need the committees that are working on initiatives such as those contained in the underlying education bill and the President of the United States. We ought to pass this education bill and we ought to get rid of any mandates as to how we ought to spend the peace dividend in the future.

With that, I will yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Texas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM].

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, let me make it clear what we are talking about. We are talking about a sense-of-the-Senate resolution that says let us take the peace dividend and let us spend it, and here are the areas it ought to be spent on. You could say this is a nonbinding sense-of-the-Senate resolution—but basically you are voting for a principle. I think that is what the distinguished Senator from Colorado wants to do. He wants to establish a principle.

The sense-of-the Senate resolution says:

> Legislation should be enacted that realigns the 1990 budget agreement to reflect the true

priorities of the American people by shifting unnecessary military spending into domestic programs, including child development, education, job training, long-term economic growth, and social well-being.

Mr. President, I am for all those things, and I think we ought to spend more money on all of them. I think we ought to spend more money on child development, education, job training, long-term economic growth, and the social well-being of America. And, quite frankly, those things do represent the true priorities of the American people.

But the debate here is about who ought to spend the money. I think that debate is going to be joined tonight by the President. I think it is going to be the No. 1 debate for the remainder of the century. I think the distinguished Senator from Colorado today, in this amendment, is staking out his position. And it is a position, obviously, that he is proud of. He believes the Government ought to spend this money, that the Government ought to be the principal beneficiary of the peace dividend.

Mr. President, I do not believe that. I believe that the long-suffering American taxpayer, who won the cold war by paying taxes year in and year out and who was deprived of money that he and she had earned as a result of paying these taxes, ought to be the principal beneficiary.

The proposal that is being made in this sense-of-the-Senate resolution is to let Congress spend the money. I think the preferable alternative is to let the American family spend the money. That is what the President is going to propose tonight, and that is what I support. I know Congress, and I know the American family, and I know the difference. I have a lot more confidence in the American family and its ability to make sound investments in its children and in its future than I have confidence in Congress making those investments.

I know we are hearing a lot of talk about how government has been deprived, but let me just take you on a little trail through the recent economic history of this country. I have here a little chart. I do not know if everybody can see it. But, basically, what it does is it starts out in 1967 and it reduces everything—family income, Federal spending, and State spending—to a baseline of 1. The whole story of this graph—and I will hold it up here for our colleagues on the other side who cannot see it, and they need to see it—is that, except for the Reagan years where family income grew, that family income basically was stagnant from 1967 to 1990. During that period, American families were struggling away, paying taxes, keeping Ivan back from the gate, winning the cold war. But all that time, Federal spending and State spending were skyrocketing.

Now we come to the point that the gate we kept Ivan back from has been torn down and we now have the prospect of converting money to civilian use—beating swords into plowshares. The question is: Looking at this graph, who ought to get these plowshares? I say the plowshares ought to go to the American family.

What is interesting is that there is nothing new under the Sun. We have done all this before. In fact, we had a peace dividend at the end of the Vietnam war. Let me give you some statistics that I think people find pretty startling.

In 1968, in real 1982 dollars, in defense spending we were spending $254.8 billion on defense. By 1980, that had declined to $164 billion. In fact, if you look at that whole period from 1968 to 1980, we cut real defense spending by $910 billion.

You might ask, if real defense ely taxes went down, the deficit went down. None of those things happened. Because what happened is that while defense was being cut from 9.6 percent of GNP to 5 percent of GNP, nondefense spending was being increased from 11.3 percent of GNP to 17.1 percent of GNP. So, in fact, if you look here at this chart I have and began in 1968, what happened from 1968 to 1980 is defense came down. What happens from 1968 to 1980 is that family income basically plodded along and did not move very much. But what happened from 1968 to 1980 is that Government went on a massive spending spree and real nondefense spending almost doubled.

With all of this Government spending—spending money on all the things that the Senator from Colorado claims to be for, what happened? Family income rose by just 2.8 percent; poverty rose, unemployment rose, test scores declined. And why? Because Government primarily was investing in the next election and not the next generation.

We are going to have many debates as to what to do about the peace dividend and who should get it. Essentially, this is a meaningless sense-of-the-Senate resolution. I guess you could run for public office on this. You can say it is nonbinding. But I think it says where we stand on the issue. I want to make it clear, I want the peace dividend to go back to American families. I do not want Government to spend it. If you vote for this resolution, you are voting to say that the peace dividend ought to be spent by Government. You are saying it ought not to be given back to the taxpayer. You are coming out against the President's middle-class tax cut that he is going to propose in the State of the Union Address tonight.

I am for that tax cut. What I think should happen is that every penny of this peace dividend ought to go back to working people, and, to the degree that it is not given back, it ought to be used to reduce the deficit. None of it should be spent.

So we are down to making fundamental decisions. They are not going to be made today. We are just posturing politically today. I think this point of order should be sustained. We should not be setting out priorities without debate. But if we were setting out priorities, these are not my priorities and I do not believe they are the priorities of the American people. I believe the American people can spend their money better than Government can spend it. And that is what this vote is about.

I yield the remainder of my time.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Washington.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington, Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. President, I support this sense-of-the-Senate amendment. The budget agreement is obsolete. The world has undergone monumental changes in the 2 years since that agreement was fashioned. It is time to update the budget agreement to reflect those changes.

This is a statement of principle. This amendment demonstrates that Congress is committed to the needs of today's Americans, not yesterday's. It reflects new national priorities, not lingering cold war fears.

The Berlin Wall has come down. It is time to remove the budget walls as well.

Who are we defending ourselves against with a $280 billion defense budget? The Soviet Union is no more. The people of the republics are starving. They have insufficient medicine. Do we help them by spending $55 billion on SDI? Do we help Americans by continuing to squeeze domestic spending?

We should be taking the position that we should be educating our people so they will have a job, that we should establish a health care system that gives Americans health protection, and that we should use the money to rebuild America. The American people want jobs, they want health care attached to those jobs, and they want skills given to them to carry out the job, not some phony tax cut of a few dollars to pay the bills they have had to run up during this recession, which has been caused by the policies that have just been advocated.

We need an American Marshall plan. We need to be certain that we have a Marshall plan for our workers like we gave Japan and Germany, and which they used to build their productive machinery. That is what this amendment is all about, and I am proud to support it. I hope it sets a new path for our country and that we accept the changes that have occurred in the world and help our people.

I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Colorado so he can yield to others.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. WIRTH. How much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado has 6 minutes 31 seconds. The Senator from New Mexico has 14 minutes and 16 seconds. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM] would like to discuss this matter in opposition to the resolution, and I yield him 4 minutes for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I think this sense of the Senate is much more specific than has been suggested. This sense of the Senate sets out a very specific funding plan and I interpret the language as stating that much of this plan will be an entitlement program. I believe that the consequence of that is to essentially say that the policy that is before us today is that virtually all of the expected reduction in defense spending will be allocated to the four areas that are listed herein.

I want to say that I strongly support all four of those areas. I come out of a long personal and political experience as an advocate, at the State and Federal level, for enhanced expenditures on education, on early childhood development, on job training. But I have serious reservations as to whether it is appropriate policy at this moment to make the following fundamental decisions:

One, the amount of the defense reduction that we are proposing to make. I believe that the United States certainly faces a different world than we did even 2 years ago. I do not believe necessarily that that is a world that is devoid of danger. I do not believe that the United States should be declaring unilateral disarmament and, therefore, I believe that our defense budget ought to be built not through the subtraction process but by the thoughtful addition process.

Let us assess what is the current threat to our national security. What are the interests the United States wants to protect and expand upon? And what is the reasonable role of the defense of our Nation in accomplishing those objectives? It is that basis that I believe should be used for the determination of how much our defense budget should be, not just an arbitrary percentage or numbers of dollars that can be reduced from a baseline that was predicated on a world different than the one in which we live today.

Second, I believe, Mr. President, that one of the keys to our economic future is going to be how we handle this transition of our military industrial complex. The reality is we have spent a substantial amount of our national wealth and particularly a substantial amount of the national wealth that has gone toward research and new technologies toward defense technologies. We have a tremendous investment in corps of technological, managerial competence which have allowed us to do enormously technical things.

Mr. President, last night I spent 2½ hours at NASA looking at the new space station that we are funding. One is stunned at the technological competence that has brought us to this point and in less than 4 years will have us constructing this station in space if the Nation continues with its current commitment to do so, and I strongly hope and feel that it will.

Much of that ability is the fact that over a period of 40 years, we have invested in high technologies that were applied first to military purposes, now are being applied to space, and will be applied to a whole variety of civilian uses. I believe that one of our goals in this transition should be to try to hold these complexes of competence together as key to our future economic well-being.

It is interesting, Mr. President, this is exactly the issue which the former Soviet Union is facing. It is asking itself, how do we make the transference into a new economy? It has recognized that a key to that is to build upon the one area of the Soviet economy that was competent, which was largely in the defense and aerospace areas and how do we keep that competence in order to transfer it to some new civilian applications?

That ought to be a question that we ought to be asking ourselves, and part of our expenditure of this peace dividend, whatever it is, in my judgment, ought to go for that purpose.

A third question that concerns me about this amendment is the issue of who decides education policy in America? This sense of the Senate is as detailed as saying that the Federal Government should assure that we have an educational environment that is conducive to learning, including a constructive student-teacher ratio. That is a very intrusive role of the Federal Government in what has traditionally been a locally-controlled, decentralized education system.

I strongly support additional funding for education, but I also strongly oppose a federalization of our education system. I suggest, for instance, Mr. President, that if we have funds available and we want to constructively assist education in a way that is consistent with our traditions of local control, I would propose the Federal Government ought to be assuming a larger share of program costs such as Medicaid, which was a proposal made in the early 1980's under the heading of new federalism so that States would have funds that they could apply to education. In my State of Florida, virtually 80 percent of all of the growth and revenue that is coming into our State government as a result of population and economic growth, 80 percent is being spent to fund the increase in our health programs, primarily the Medicaid Program.

If we want to release money for education, Mr. President, I suggest the way to do it is to have the Federal Government assume the larger share of its responsibility in those areas for which it has a primary responsibility, such as Medicaid, so the States can do their appropriate role in our Federal system of more adequately funding education.

So I conclude by saying the spirit of this is well intended, very positive, and I support it. The specifics in terms of how to accomplish the objective, I believe, are flawed and should, therefore, be held in abeyance for another day when we can have a fuller debate on the direction of our country in this new post-cold-war era.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. President, I just want to make a point, since the Senator from Florida has so eloquently pointed out some specifics, including the fact that this resolution says that we ought to create new entitlements. I suggest that if this chart shows the explosion of Federal expenditures, I think anyone who knows anything about our budget would say this is because of entitlements.

I am not looking forward to voting for a single new entitlement program for the United States. In fact, I think before we put any new ones on the books, we ought to commit ourselves to take some of the old ones off. It is very difficult to tell the American people we cannot do anything about program expenditures because the program is an entitlement and we fund it according to the law. They say "Who are you? You make the laws." I tell them we have to undo a whole law. They say, "We thought you appropriated the money." I say, we used to but we do not anymore because 51 percent of the budget goes to entitlement programs, automatic payments to recipients who are eligible, including our farmers, ranchers and students. Fifty-one percent of the budget is automatic.

Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Florida for raising the points that he raised. We ought to deny this resolution and vote no. We ought to say the budget agreement of the United States and the Budget Act make good sense and we should not be doing a resolution like this. If we want to vote for the resolution, then we ought to be honest and say specifically

what we want the peace dividend to be used for. I do not believe anyone is ready to make those kind of decisions today. Certainly not the kind of decisions this resolution calls for.

Having said that, I want to talk a minute about the American family. My good friend from Texas, Senator GRAMM, raised the point that, clearly, if we are going to spend defense money, we ought to spend some of it for the American family. Frankly, I say to my friends on the other side, Senator WIRTH, who I have known for a long time, and Senator WELLSTONE, who I am beginning to know and understand and work with, I believe the biggest problem with American education today is the demise and death of the value system in the United States. I believe every teacher in the United States would say, if you will give us disciplined children, if you will give us children who care about learning, if you will give us parents who care enough about their children to worry about what they are doing in school, we do not care about all these new-fangled programs.

The truth of the matter is the value system of the United States has disappeared. The opposite to what we know as traditional American values is being beat into our children on television, on radio and in newspapers until children do not know right from wrong. When they reach age 14 or 15, they bring their own gun to school, if they can get away with it, or carry their own knife. Teachers cannot teach. I believe that many of our children have lost their family support system.

Frankly, I do not know if Government can help with that. It is one of those intangibles. We need a renaissance, many people have said. But I think we need a renaissance in basic values in America, if not a renaissance in family life. A renaissance where there is the togetherness and giving of esteem to one another that goes on in a family. I believe that has left the scene in the American family, and I am not at all sure that Government can fix it.

But I do believe that we ought to say to the American family, that we are not going to tax the socks off you while you are trying to raise your children. Whether you are single, head of household, or married, you are working and struggling to make a living, and we will bend every single tax policy in this country in your favor. That would at least show that we care about the value of a family, a value without which we will not succeed with our children.

I know for many in this country, they say we can work this out at the Government level, we can put more money in the States and the States will take care of this with social service workers; or we will have teachers helpers, or we will do all kinds of things to sort of fill that vacuum.

I do not believe the vacuum of the American family is going to be filled. I believe it is only going to be filled when the children themselves have the kind of help wherever they spend most of their hours, which is not in the schoolhouse and not in front of teachers. It is at home. American leaders, business leaders and others, can change things a bit. They can look at themselves and see what they are paying for on television, on radios and in newspaper ads.

I see this argument today, as I understand it, as an argument to commit the entire pace dividend to cover only those things which a few Senators have decided that they want. I do not think we ought to do that. I think we have other priorities. I think the Budget Act is effective; I do not think we should waive it.

I believe some votes will be obtained by telling Senators the resolution does not preclude everybody's favorite option. Senators will be calmed and say, well, we will vote for it then. I submit if that is the case, we should not have the resolution before us because it really stands for nothing. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from Colorado has 6 minutes, 31 seconds. The Senator from New Mexico has 1 minute, 90 seconds.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I do not disagree in any way, shape, or form with the emphasis the Senator from New Mexico has placed on this restructure and commitment to a value position related to families and individual responsibility.

But it is also a very clear value commitment as to what we want our public institutions to do. Do we believe in investments and education of the future, or of starving these institutions? Are we going to continue to neglect the youngest?

These are the other kinds of enormously important values and priorities. I have made mine as clear as possible, as has the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Massachusetts and others.

A final note. This is not an entitlement program in any way, shape, or form. In fact we are implicitly discussing only discretionary spending. Nor are we saying this vast expansion of budget is not due to entitlements. The percentage of the budget going to discretionary spending has dropped since 1980 and, by the way, the percentage of the budget going to debt service, an entitlement, has increased by an even greater amount than the decline in discretionary.

If we have anything that is amiss in this country in terms of what is right and wrong, it is spending this huge amount of money, running up this vast debt in the last 12 years and then neglecting our young people, who get nothing for the debt. We are leaving young people without the investment in the future which has always fueled the American dream. I yield 4 minutes to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WOFFORD. Mr. President, I join the Senators from Colorado and Minnesota in calling for the redirection of our Nation's priorities toward the vital human challenges American families are facing. Since the 1990 budget agreement, the world has turned upside down. It is time for America to turn its priorities right side up.

As John Kennedy once said, "America cannot be strong abroad if we are weak at home." That does not mean we should be weak abroad, but it does mean it is time for us to commit the same resources, energy, and urgency we put into foreign emergencies to the human emergencies here at home. That is especially true when it comes to the billions of dollars we have been pouring into the defense of our prosperous allies against a threat that no longer exists and investing now those funds in America's families and future.

No one can disagree that the military threats which existed at the time of the budget agreement have been dramatically diminished. The level of military spending envisioned by the budget agreement has been overtaken by events. Eastern Europe is being democratized and almost unimaginable changes have taken place in the former Soviet Union. Regardless of whatever wisdom there was in the budget walls that were put in the agreement in 1990, those walls are now preventing us from addressing problems here at home.

I respectfully disagree with the reading of this resolution by the distinguished Senator from Florida. This resolution says nothing about unilateral disarmament, nothing about particular amounts of military savings. It assumes there are military savings, as the President has proposed and more to be proposed here tonight.

What it says is whatever the military spending has been, we should direct the savings to promote the Nation's long-term economic growth and social well-being including, not limited to but including early childhood development, education, and job training. I agree with that premise. For many years, communities have confronted the challenge of educating those with special needs and those raised in poverty without enough Federal aid. Education is vital to the long-term health and security of this Nation.

I hope that tonight the President in his State of the Union message will call for bringing down the budget walls and declare an intention to help address the domestic problems so long neglected, because in the future our strength in the world will not be defined as much by our bombs as by our brains. My vote today is to call for the President to join us in that effort.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time? The Senator from New Mexico has 1 minute and 9 seconds remaining, the Senator from Colorado 2 minutes 3 seconds.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, the Senate will soon be voting on waiving the Budget Act so that this sense-of-the-Senate resolution can move forward. The reason that this rather simple statement of purpose is subject to a budget point of order is that it deals with Federal budget matter and S. 2 is not a bill reported by the Budget Committee. So, in spite of the fact that the amendment is nonbinding and does not have the force of law, it is still subject to this point of order.

So why should Senators support this waiver? Because this amendment is about more than just the budget—its about priorities. The sense-of-the-Senate amendment being offered by Senator WELLSTONE and myself states simply that the world has changed—I think it would be hard to deny that—and that we need to realign our Federal budget priorities to reflect this shift.

First, the Soviet Union is gone. What is left behind is a collection of economically struggling, self-absorbed republics with formidable problems of their own. They pose little threat to the United States, and with the dissolution of the U.S.S.R. our defense strategy has become obsolete. This also means that the Budget Enforcement Act is obsolete as well, and should be changed. That is what this amendment calls for.

Reducing our defense expenditures has bipartisan support. Senators from both sides of the aisle have suggested varying levels of further reductions in military spending, reallocating this money for other uses. This amendment does not state a level, it simply says that military spending should be reallocated for other, more pressing needs.

Second, economists from across the range of ideologies have said that the investments that have made our economy strong in the past are lacking today. For the last decade we have shortchanged our children's education, while saddling them with debt accumulated by a decade of huge deficits. We need to invest in education, child nutrition and health, research and development, and infrastructure. Our failure to do so carries a terrible price—the gradual decline of the United States, and a lower standard of living for our children.

Mr. President, I am sure that everywhere my colleagues go, they hear what I do. They hear the American people asking us to reform our Government—to reflect the monumentous movement toward peace that this world has seen. For months people have been talking about how we can now cut defense spending and reinvest in ourselves. People are ready for these changes.

For more than a decade, the needs of our children and youth have been seriously neglected. In that time, defense has seen a 56-percent increase in spending, while programs to enhance the lives of children and long-term economic growth have experienced growth of only 5 percent.

The failure to invest in early childhood development, in job training, and education creates long-term social costs, rather than long-term productivity and economic growth. We must turn the tide—we must restore the people's faith in the Government that we can do the right thing. We can see that the Budget Act of 1990 does not carry us into 1992, so we will change it. We are not so entrenched in the inside the beltway mindset that we are oblivious to what is happening in real life America.

We have offered an amendment—a sense-of-the-Senate resolution—that states that in order to meet our great needs at home, we need flexibility in our budget. By binding ourselves by the straitjacket of the budget agreement of 1990, we are limiting what our Government can do for the citizens of the country. In doing that, we are limiting our own potential.

While I voted against the Budget Enforcement Act which was offered as an amendment to the 1990 reconciliation bill, I recognize that many of my colleagues did not. But surely we can all recognize that to say that times have changed since 1990 is something of an understatement.

Our No. 1 educational goal is that all children should enter school ready to learn. We are already behind where we must be to make this goal a reality—and it should be a reality. We know that Head Start works. We know that kids' minds can be enriched and their school work improved if they are ready to take in the educational opportunities provided to them.

Despite 25 years of proven success—not even 30 percent of eligible children participate in Head Start. Ensuring that all eligible 3-, 4-, and 5-year-old children have the opportunity to participate in Head Start is a basic—we should not even have to wonder if this program should be fully funded.

But without changes in our current Federal budget, Head Start will never be fully funded. We will not be able to support teacher training programs that bring new vigor to the classroom. We will not be able to reduce the number of children in each classroom.

We will throw roadblocks in front of the innovation that needs to happen in our schools. We will have done little to ensure that students leave the elementary and secondary grade with high levels of academic achievement. We will have left untrained our front-line workers and our businesses without the support they need. We will have told those that always thought that a higher education was beyond their means that they were right—it is.

If we fail to make this essential change, to take down the walls between military spending and spending on our children, in 1993 we will not be able to pay for inflation in our education programs. The Congressional Budget Office last week reported that we must cut 3 percent off of baseline to meet the caps in 1993. In 1994 and 1995, we must cut another 8 percent.

I think it is clear to us that this country is in no position to take cuts in critical human investments.

Voting to waive the Budget Act so that we can pass this amendment will provide us the opportunity to tell our constituents that we are committed to passing the necessary legislation to break down the budget walls. Then we will be able to consider legislation to actually make the shift from unnecessary military spending into domestic priorities—including early childhood development, education, and job training.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, when the budget agreement was reached in 1990, I voted against it, in part, because I was concerned that it baked in numbers for spending that were inconsistent with the need to substantially reduce the budget deficit and that it ignored the changes taking place in the world which might allow for a reduction in defense expenditures. The Wirth-Wellstone resolution before the Senate today offers the Senate an opportunity to go on record as saying that the 1990 budget agreement should be modified to allow for some of the savings from cutting the military budget to be used to fund a greater investment in education or other urgent purposes.

I am pleased to hear Senator WIRTH indicate that he believes that this resolution is consistent with also using a substantial portion of defense savings to reduce the budget deficit. I believe that such a deficit reduction effort is essential. To quote from the Congressional Budget Office analysis released last week.

> The budget deficit remains a serious economic and social problem. * * * Such large budget deficits impair economic growth by reducing national saving and capital formation. Deficits also create a vicious cycle of more federal borrowing and higher debt service costs, which in turn make it still more difficult to reduce the deficit.

The CBO report goes on to point out one of the consequences that increased debt service costs have on other discretionary spending. It states:

> Together, discretionary spending and net interest spending are about as large as they were 10 years ago, but a larger portion is consumed by interest and a smaller portion is being devoted to programs that provide services and satisfaction to the public.

Mr. President, in order to be effective, this resolution needs to be followed up with action. That will be the

challenge of this session of the Congress.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise to express my strong opposition to the pending sense of the Senate resolution offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH].

Mr. President, if we adopt this resolution, we are effectively abandoning the budget agreement that we labored to produce less than 18 months ago. The wall between defense and domestic programs will finally be pierced after numerous failed efforts by colleagues on the other side of the aisle to break that barrier.

I ask my colleagues: Is this legislation the appropriate vehicle to break down the 1990 budget agreement? I believe it is up to the President, the House and Senate leadership, and all Members of the Congress to fully consider how we should spend the so-called peace dividend and that this resolution is inappropriate and untimely on this bill.

Moreover, this resolution sets us on a course to take whatever savings accrue from the changing international military balance and shift those savings into new entitlements and expanded spending for current domestic programs. In the name of helping our children and our children's children, the authors of this amendment appear to believe that the best we can do is to spend more taxpayer dollars on programs, many of which may have outlived their usefulness.

For example, the resolution recommends that we take part of the peace dividend and use it for expanded student loan programs. In this Senator's view, the current Student Loan Program needs top-to-bottom revision. Before we simply throw more money into student loan programs, we must consider alternatives such as I have proposed along with Senator SIMON.

Most important, Mr. President, I believe that if we want to do the best for the future of this country and its citizens, the best thing we could do is take the lion's share of the peace dividend and use it to reduce the Federal deficit.

Mr. President, over the past 12 years, we have allowed the Federal deficit to grow by more than $2.4 trillion. The national debt is rapidly approaching $4 trillion and interest on the debt has become the third largest component of Federal spending. We must make a real commitment to eliminate this deficit rather than shifting Federal spending from one account to another.

Mr. President, yesterday a great American retailer, Macy's, filed for chapter 11 bankruptcy. Why has this company sought the protection of the Bankruptcy Court? It is not because the company made poor fashion judgments. It is simply because the company took on too much debt during the 1980's.

There is a lesson here, Mr. President. And the lesson is that unless we begin to face up to this massive deficit, we are going to leave our entire Nation poorer for decades to come. We can ill afford to shift dollar-for-dollar from the defense budget to domestic programs without ultimately making our children worse off.

Mr. WIRTH. Mr. President, I think we have had a good, full, and fair debate on this particular issue. I think it is very clear what the sense-of-the-Senate resolution is that as we change our country's priorities—a high priority in my opinion—it should be the highest, but others have high priorities, which must be a very significant commitment to education.

What could be a further and more resounding commitment to the future and to the change the country is asking of us? We know we are going to go through some very painful transitions. We know that is the case. The best way to start is through education and retraining. That must be the first and foremost commitment. That is what we are going to be doing. That is what communities are going to be doing, what schools are going to be doing as the country is looking to be more competitive. That is what we must be doing at the university level. That is what we must do for our young people. This is a sense-of-the-Senate resolution which simply expresses as we make the change to reflect the new world that this is a very clear priority. It must include Head Start, retraining, and so on.

I thank my colleagues very much for their support during this discussion. Mr. President, if the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has yielded back all of his time, I yield back my time.

Mr. DOMENICI. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. All time having been yielded back, the question is on the motion——

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. KENNEDY. Yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The request has been made for the yeas and nays. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion to waive the Congressional Budget Act for the consideration of amendment No. 1490 offered by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WIRTH]. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. KENNEDY. Parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Is a vote aye a vote to waive the Budget Act?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct, a vote aye is a vote to waive the Budget Act.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber who desire to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 45, nays 53, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 8 Leg.]

YEAS—45

Adams	Dixon	Mitchell
Akaka	Exon	Moynihan
Baucus	Ford	Pell
Bentsen	Fowler	Pryor
Biden	Gore	Reid
Bingaman	Hollings	Riegle
Boren	Johnston	Robb
Bradley	Kennedy	Rockefeller
Breaux	Kerry	Sanford
Bryan	Kohl	Sarbanes
Burdick	Lautenberg	Sasser
Byrd	Leahy	Simon
Conrad	Levin	Wellstone
Cranston	Metzenbaum	Wirth
Daschle	Mikulski	Wofford

NAYS—53

Bond	Gorton	Murkowski
Brown	Graham	Nickles
Bumpers	Gramm	Nunn
Burns	Grassley	Packwood
Chafee	Hatch	Pressler
Coats	Hatfield	Roth
Cochran	Heflin	Rudman
Cohen	Helms	Seymour
Craig	Inouye	Shelby
D'Amato	Jeffords	Simpson
Danforth	Kassebaum	Smith
DeConcini	Kasten	Specter
Dodd	Lieberman	Stevens
Dole	Lott	Symms
Domenici	Lugar	Thurmond
Durenberger	Mack	Wallcp
Garn	McCain	Warner
Glenn	McConnell	

NOT VOTING—2

Harkin	Kerrey

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote the yeas are 45 and the nays are 53. Three-fifths of the Senators present and voting, not having voted in the affirmative, the motion to waive the Budget Act is rejected.

Amendment No. 1490, which proposes a changed matter within the jurisdiction of the Budget Committee, has been offered to a bill that was not reported by the Budget Committee, in violation of section 306 of the Congressional Budget Act, and, therefore, the amendment falls.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. KENNEDY. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, just for the information of the membership, there is a Seymour amendment, which we are going to accept, and there are, I think, other amendments which have been worked out; the amendments themselves will have to be modified. But I see no reason, unless there are others in here who want to make extensive statements, that we cannot finish this or at least start final passage in about 15 or 20 minutes. That is our hope. I have talked to Senator KASSEBAUM and Senator COCHRAN as well as Senator HATCH, and that is roughly

their understanding also. Nothing is very definite, but that is at least the current condition of the legislation.

Mr. SEYMOUR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the Kennedy amendment No. 1492.

Mr. SEYMOUR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 1487, AS MODIFIED

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I rise to bring up amendment No. 1487, which had been set aside. After consultation with my colleagues on the committee we have agreed do new language. I understand the amendment has been accepted by both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a right to call for regular order with regard to amendment 1487.

Mr. KENNEDY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SEYMOUR. Certainly.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand it, there is some new language.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Correct.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand it, the Senator will send that to the desk so that we can take action. Is that the intention of the Senator?

Mr. SEYMOUR. Yes, that is my intention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to modifying the amendment?

Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is modified.

The amendment (No. 1487), as modified, is as follows:

On page 34, line 11, insert ", if such initiatives permit parents of students served by a school to choose a school in accordance with this clause and encourage parents to participate in governance, management processes, or activities related to their children's education programs" before the semicolon.

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I also ask that amendment No. 1488 be withdrawn at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, amendment No. 1488 is withdrawn.

The amendment (No. 1488) was withdrawn.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, this amendment involves parental involvement in these choices and decisions. That was always the intention of the managers. I think the Senator has added some clarifying language to make it even more explicit. So it is completely consistent with the thrust of the legislation. We thank the Senator for his cooperation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question occurs on amendment No. 1487, as modified.

Mr. KENNEDY. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment of the Senator from California be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment (No. 1487), as modified, was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1492

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, there is a small technical amendment that is necessary to ensure that the funds actually are appropriated under the 1992 appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, HHS, and Education. This amendment has been drafted with the assistance of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and has been cleared with him. It has also been cleared with the House Appropriations Committee. I believe it is now acceptable to the other side of the aisle.

Last year, at the time of the appropriations, the language indicated the nature of the follow-on legislation, and the Department of Education has had some concern whether this legislation falls within that particular definition. Clearly, this is an expression of the Senate consistent with that earlier language and this technical amendment will ensure that when legislation is actually passed—it will have to be put through the House, have to go to conference, it will have been signed by the President, hopefully, or otherwise disposed of—that those resources can be expended consistent with what the legislation is that we have adopted.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, that is agreed to on this side.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, the vision for America 2000, as articulated by the President last April, originally led me to fight to reserve $100 million, in the Appropriations Committee conference last fall, for activities associated with America 2000. Specifically I was interested in supporting the creation of break-the-mold schools throughout our country.

While I remain hopeful that the America 2000 activities that were envisioned to be supported by the funding that the committee agreed to set aside, may still be included in a final education bill that comes out of the conference with the House, I nonetheless remain disappointed that, by amendment, S. 2 would allow the $100 million to be used for activities other than those that are a part of the America 2000 proposal.

I agree with President Bush and Secretary Alexander that bold and dramatic changes, like those spelled out in the America 2000 strategy, are needed in our education system if we are going to keep the United States competitive in the international marketplace and second to no other nation in the world.

It was that bold spirit of education reform that fueled my efforts to support many elements of the President's legislative package. And it was that spirit that moved me to persuade my colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to set aside the funds for America 2000, pending its authorization this spring.

But as we now know, based on the legislative actions of this body last week, there will be another education reform package, a compromise bill, not the transforming bill proposed by President Bush and Secretary Alexander.

I look forward to working with my distinguished colleagues in this body to advance the cause of education reform. Since the House still needs to act and a conference to be held, I must however, point out that we do have a long way to go before work on this education reform package is completed.

Consequently, it is my sincerest hope that when the smoke clears after all the debate, we will send a bill to the President that is similar to the one the President proposed last spring, rather than similar to the one about to be cleared by this body today.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, have we acted now on the technical amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1492.

The amendment (No. 1492) was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 1481

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we have a small modification of the sense-of-the-Senate resolution on the Peace Corps that was adopted on Friday. I understand this amendment has been cleared on both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, amendment No. 1481 is so modified.

The modification to amendment No. 1481 is as follows:

In clause (1) of the section stating the sense of the Senate with respect to the Peace Corps, as added by amendment by Senator Wellstone (amendment No. 1481), insert ", as part of a balanced program and without diminishing its efforts in other parts of the world," after "effectively". In clause (2) of that section, insert ", consistent with clause (1)," after "President".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Is the Senator from Ohio correct that his amendment which was offered last week is presently pending?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio needs to call the amendment back to the floor.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Pardon?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio needs to call the amendment back to the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1483

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask for the regular order in order to call the amendment of the Senator from Ohio back at this time and make it the pending order of business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is amendment No. 1483, offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I now withdraw that amendment.

The amendment (No. 1483) was withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 1496

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM] proposes an amendment numbered 1496.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following new section:

SEC. . GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORT ON THE EFFECT OF TAX INCENTIVES ON LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE.

(a) Within 180 days after the date of enactment, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources a study on the nature and extent of tax abatements given by state and local governments to attract business and the extent to which such abatements:

(i) reduce the tax base available to support public elementary and secondary education in the jurisdiction granting the abatement;

(ii) reduce the funds available to support elementary and secondary schools in the jurisdiction granting the abatement; and

(iii) review the extent to which citizens in the state and local community granting the abatement realize the potential impact of the abatement on funding for local public schools.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, the amendment I had previously offered and that was at the desk over the weekend had to do with the question of various school districts, cities, States, offering economic tax advantages to various corporations. There has developed a competition between the States as to who can give more, or which State or community can give more in tax abatements in order to bring corporations into those communities.

Understandably, corporations have been willing to accept those abatements and have taken that into consideration in locating their plants.

The net result has been that the school systems of this country have been negatively impacted by hundreds of millions of dollars. It is time we take another look at this subject.

The amendment I had originally sent to the desk would have deducted from the economic development funds of any State, that amount of tax abatements that had been given in an earlier period. That was a rather drastic step but it highlights the severity of the problem.

Since many Members of this body had not been familiar with the issue and were not prepared to vote as to the impact that it would have, and since there had not been much advanced notice given with respect to the amendment, the Senator from Ohio has withdrawn the earlier amendment and sent to the desk a substitute amendment which would order the GAO to make a study as to the economic impact of these tax abatements on the school systems of this country, and instructs the GAO to report back within 6 months in order to advise the Members of Congress and the people of this country, what economic impact this is having on the school systems of this country.

It is my understanding the amendment has been cleared on both sides of the aisle. If that is the case I am prepared to act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts is recognized.

Mr. KENNEDY. As I understand it, within 180 days the GAO is to conduct a study to determine the nature and extent of the tax abatements given by State and local governments to attract business and the extent to which such abatements, one, reduce the tax base available to support public elementary and secondary education in the jurisdiction granting the abatement; two, reduce the funds available to support elementary and secondary schools in the jurisdiction granting the abatement, and, three, review the extent to which citizens in the State or local community granting the abatement realize the potential impact of the abatement on the funding of local public schools.

Mr. President, the Senator has sent the amendment to the desk. I have every intention of supporting the amendment. I believe we wanted to just give an opportunity to some of our colleagues to look at that briefly; I expect for no more than a few moments. Then we could, hopefully, dispose of that.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I ask the Senator from Ohio, who would receive this report after it is completed by the GAO.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I believe it has been drafted and worked out with Senator KENNEDY's staff. I believe it has been drafted to report to the minority and majority member, the majority and minority leadership of the Labor and Human Resources Committee.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. The full committee?

Mr. METZENBAUM. Yes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Could I indicate we obviously would have an opportunity then to examine it, to review it, to hear those who wish to comment on it. To the extent the committee then wants to make some adjustments, we are going to have the reauthorization next year, for example, of the basic elementary-secondary education. It will be available to whatever extent the Members feel that it is relevant to that reauthorization. That is, at least, what our intention would be.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I think this is a very important issue, Mr. President. This study could be useful. I think every State, now, has many instances in which tax abatements are offered. I think this GAO study is useful, to see what effect this situation is having on school financing.

Mr. METZENBAUM. I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, we are prepared to voice our support for the measure. I am grateful to the Senator from Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no further debate, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, amendment No. 1496.

The amendment (No. 1496) was agreed to.

Mr. METZENBAUM. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. BOREN. Would the distinguished chairman yield for colloquy?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. For the purpose of clarification I would like to ask the chairman what is intended as criteria for schools that wish to apply for funds provided in this act for magnet schools. Is it the chairman's intention to include schools systems that have achieved unitary status if such systems include one or more elementary or secondary schools in which minority group student enrollment exceeds 80 percent of the total enrollment and if the funds are directed toward such schools?

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the opportunity to clarify this point. It is the committee's intention that for the purposes of this act, the term "magnet school" refers to a school in a local education agency that attracts children regardless of mandatory attendance zones. It is our intention that such schools as described by the Senator from Oklahoma shall be eligible for magnet school funding through their local education agencies under this act.

Mr. BOREN. I thank the chairman for clarifying the intention of Congress with regard to this act.

Mr. FORD. Would my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the committee, yield for colloquy?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would be pleased to yield for that purpose.

Mr. FORD. As my colleague knows, Kentucky has just undergone a comprehensive statewide education reform initiative, brought on by a 1989 decision of the Kentucky Supreme Court. While I wholeheartedly support this legislation, I was concerned that this legislation did not recognize the efforts States, like mine, have already made to implement reform and meet many of the national goals we spell out here.

I commend my colleague for accommodating these concerns by accepting language to the modification which I sought to allow States like Kentucky to bypass the requirement for developing a comprehensive State reform plan. Under my language, States will be able to apply to the Secretary of Education for a waiver of the first-year requirements. Such States will have to give the same assurances that nonwaiver States make, but they will not have to use first-year funds to develop a State improvement plan. Instead, States receiving a waiver will be able to use first year funding to begin making grants to neighborhood public schools.

I would ask my colleague, is it the intent of the managers that States, such as Kentucky, be allowed to bypass the first-year funding requirement for development of a State neighborhood schools improvement plan?

Mr. KENNEDY. I appreciate the Senator from Kentucky raising this issue. It is not our intent that States that have already developed and implemented State reform plans be forced to repeat those efforts. States such as Kentucky, South Carolina, Oklahoma, and others, have spent considerable resources and time developing State school reform plans. Under provisions of the modification, as amended by this language, such States can apply to the Secretary for a waiver of this requirement, and begin using funds as otherwise allowed in the first year, or as provided for in second and succeeding years.

Mr. FORD. I thank the chairman, Senator KENNEDY, and the ranking member of the committee, Senator HATCH, for accommodating the concerns and efforts of Kentucky by including this language in the pending bill. We certainly support, and encourage, education reform in Kentucky and I am pleased to support this important legislation which will enhance our efforts.

Mr. KENNEDY. I commend my colleague for raising this issue and thank him for his provision, which strengthens this legislation.

Mr. BOREN. Would my distinguished colleague yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. I would be happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. I want to join my colleague from Kentucky in thanking the managers of the bill for making this modification. As the Senator from Massachusetts has already indicated, Oklahoma is also one of those States which has already developed reform plans. In our case, the people of the State have affirmed support for these plans in a statewide vote. It would have been unfortunate indeed and unfair if States which had already made tremendous efforts were not recognized for their actions. That is why I, along with my colleague Senator NICKLES, have been working with the Senator from Kentucky to develop this language which will allow States like ours to proceed ahead with the implementation of their reform plans. I appreciate the sensitivity of the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Utah and others to the need to make this change in the original bill.

NEW PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY] to clarify a question for me. In the section of the bill relating to new public schools. Would it be possible that a school which: First, offers curriculum options that best match the needs of the students served by the system, such as college preparatory, vocational education, math and science, or cultural arts; second, recruits into the system teachers with specialized skills, especially skills in mathematics, science, and bilingual education, from professionals in fields other than education; third, permits parents of students served by the school, and require parents that choose their child's school, to participate in governance, management processes, and activities relating to educational programs; fourth, establishes a preschool transition program such as Follow Through, to assist students within the school who were previously enrolled in Head Start or similar program in making a transition to elementary school, ensuring that at-risk students will receive needed assistance; be considered a new public school as described in S. 2?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, a school that designed its program including those elements would qualify as a new public school.

INNOVATIVE TEACHING TECHNOLOGY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished floor manager, the Senator from Massachusetts, a question regarding the education reforms that would merit funding under S. 2. Would the manager yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes.

Mr. DASCHLE. As the Senator knows, in rural States such as South Dakota, the need for innovative teaching methods and devices often is accompanied by a lack of resources—including teachers—due to vast populations and low incomes. One technology that has shown promise in overcoming some of these difficulties is a system known as interactive television. This technology allows students to interact with television screens through questions, choices, and discussions presented in the educational program. This technology is considered cost-effective and very simple to operate and, thus, has promise for educational instruction in both rural and urban areas.

I notice that in section 208 of title II, which outlines the authorized uses for grants given to schools for education reform, there is a list of several programs or innovations that would be considered eligible for funding under S. 2.

Would the Senator consider this an exhaustive list of reforms eligible for funding?

Mr. KENNEDY. No, not at all. I would inform the Senator from South Dakota that this list is merely illustrative and that other appropriate uses would be permissible.

Mr. DASCHLE. So, if a school wished to implement a program utilizing interactive TV to improve student achievement, and the State's advisory council approved, this program would be considered an appropriate use of those funds?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator is correct. In fact, under subsection (b)(10), the bill states that funding for projects which increase the use of educational technology and integrate such technology into the instruction program of the school are permissible.

Mr. DASCHLE. I thank the Senator for clarifying this issue.

THE ELEMENTARY SCIENCE FACILITIES ACT

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, on November 21, 1991, I filed an amendment to S. 2 entitled "The Elementary Science Facilities Act." My amendment would provide funds for matching grants to enable schools to purchase equipment and materials needed for hands-on discovery lessons in their elementary classrooms. This proposal recognizes that children gain scientific knowledge most effectively through investigation and hands-on discovery activities.

By funding the Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act, Congress has provided support for excellent teacher enhancement activities which provide training in new curricula and methodologies. Unfortunately, many elementary school teachers are unable to fully implement new techniques for teaching science and mathematics because their schools lack adequate resources. One-third of all science classrooms in grades four through six had no scientific equipment at all in 1985–86. That same year, 64 percent of all minority third grade students reported that they had never used a microscope.

The results are distressing. Research indicates that half of our young students have lost interest in science and mathematics by the time they leave the seventh grade. This situation must

be remedied if America is to produce a technologically literate work force as well as the engineers, scientists and mathematics needed to remain economically competitive in an increasingly complex world.

In 1990, the Congress unanimously passed the Excellence in Mathematics, Science and Engineering Act. This bill, authored by Senator KENNEDY and me, set forth national objectives which included improving the quality of teaching in mathematics and science. My amendment provides the next logical step in assuring that all of our young students have access to instructional experiences which foster critical and creative thinking and capture their interest in these important fields. Our young children must have the opportunity to learn science by doing science.

I would like to thank my colleague, Senator PELL, for his commitment to consider this amendment during his subcommittee's upcoming work on the reauthorization of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement. I look forward to working with him and other members of the Labor Committee to ensure that elementary teachers have the tools they need to inspire children in mathematics and science.

Mr. PELL. I would like to commend my colleague from Oregon for his longstanding dedication to improving science and mathematics education for the Nation's children. His amendment addresses a critical part of the problem—attracting and keeping a child's interest in the sciences through hands-on exploration opportunities.

There are clear signals that we must work to improve our elementary science and mathematics programs. The National Assessment of Educational Progress recently provided data from its 1985-86 tests on the proficiency of 9-year-old students in analysis of scientific procedures and data. I was pleased, of course, to learn that 9-year-olds in the Northeast had the highest percentage of students demonstrating an understanding of the design of experiments. However, you can imagine my dismay when I learned that this highest percentage was only 5.4 percent of all 9-year-olds tested. Nationally, only 3 percent of the 9-year-olds demonstrated some understanding of the design of experiments or any degree of specialized knowledge across the subdisciplines of science.

We know that far too few of our students take upper level science and mathematics courses in high school. There have also been many disturbing reports on the low numbers of minorities and women entering fields which require a strong background in mathematics and science. If we hope to encourage more of our young people to prepare for these challenging disciplines, we must remedy the problem of inadequate elementary science equipment and materials as well as other critical problems such as teacher training and curriculum development. All young children should have challenging educational experiences, including access to hands-on activities which stimulate interest in mathematics and science.

I share the commitment of the Senator from Oregon to this important issue and I look forward to working with him when my subcommittee next considers legislation to reauthorize the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

S. 2, NATIVE AMERICAN PARTICIPATION IN THE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I am very pleased to support Senator BINGAMAN's efforts to amend S. 2 so that American Indians will be able to participate in the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, as authorized in S. 2.

It is well known that the academic achievement of young Native Americans is far below any other ethnic or cultural group. By recognizing the special needs of Native Americans, I believe we can definitely help with systemic school reform and improvement.

It is my hope that the U.S. Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Indian Affairs will identify the Indian schools most in need of this type of grant money. Many public schools as well as Bureau operated schools serve over 40,000 New Mexico Indian students.

In particular, I am very interested in strengthening parent involvement and dropout prevention through culturally sensitive curriculum improvements. Life management skills instruction is another idea that could be funded with this type of grant money. The New Mexico recommendations to the White House Conference on Indian Education included these two ideas as well as an emphasis on bilingual programs.

I am encouraged that the Senate has agreed to help make these and other substantive changes to the daily educational experience of the young Indian people of this Nation.

Mr. President, I commend my colleague, Senator BINGAMAN, for his fine efforts on behalf of Indian children in public schools and Bureau of Indian Affairs schools. I look forward to working with New Mexico's Indian education institutions to promote more effective neighborhood schools for Native Americans.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Is it the Senator's understanding that nothing in this title shall be interpreted to prohibit the provision of a grant from a State to a school under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

Mr. KENNEDY. It is my understanding that in the case that a State has located within its boundaries a school(s) under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the application from each State for grants under this title shall include an assurance that nothing in this title shall be interpreted to prohibit the provision of a grant to, or prejudice an application for such a grant from such a school.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Is it the understanding of the Senator from Massachusetts that the conference committee will discuss this issue of grants to schools under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs?

Mr. KENNEDY. I cannot speak for the committee but I certainly will work toward addressing this issue within the conference. I am aware that the Federal Government has a direct responsibility and obligation for education of Native Americans. I am aware that Native American education has very serious problems and the issue of education for Native Americans is a trust responsibility which the Congress must take very seriously.

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise in support of passage of S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bill.

This legislation establishes a set of national education goals, promotes their achievement, establishes a National Council on Education Goals, sets up a National Report Card to measure progress towards these goals and provides resources for local districts to develop new, break the mold schools, through a Neighborhood Schools Grant Program. The Senate has also adopted an amendment that would let some schools try to prove that they can do their jobs better and more effectively, if they could be free from some of the Federal red tape—however well-intentioned—that accompanies some of our Federal education grants.

If there has ever been a time to invest in our children it is now. Our Nation is locked in a global competition in which victory will go not to those nations with the greatest natural resources, but to those with the greatest human resources. Victory will go to those nations which have a workforce that is skilled, educated, and able to meet the technological challenges of the next century. The link between a nation's economic prosperity and its commitment to education has never been more clear than it is today.

Several studies show that America's children perform near the bottom in academic achievement as compared with other Western countries. Children in Germany and Japan attend school approximately 240 days per year as compared to 180 here in the United States. The United States spends 4.1 percent of its gross domestic product on elementary and secondary education, trailing 13 other industrialized countries, including Germany, Japan, Canada, France, and Great Britain. While I hope that we can take immediate steps to lift us out of this reces-

sion, our ultimate economic prosperity lies in the ability of our children and schools to achieve the national education goals. To accomplish this, we must undertake fundamental reform in our schools.

In recent years, the issue of school reform has been a turbulent one in my State. New Jersey has had to grapple with such difficult issues as school financing and slumping academic performance. However, New Jersey has not stood still despite these ominous problems. Parents, educators, teachers and the business community have come together to improve our schools through new and innovative approaches.

There are many examples of innovative schools in my State. For example, the Bergen schools are experimenting with distance learning via telecommunications, Atlantic City is conducting a business partnership program with its public schools, the Montclair School system has adopted a creative Magnet School Program and the State is in the process of adopting a comprehensive school-based social service program.

In addition, a Quality Education Commission established by our governor has recently made recommendations about educational requirements that will address the needs of New Jersey's children, communities and businesses in the year 2000 and beyond. The Commission was made up of parents, teachers, administrators, business leaders and academics. This Commission has proposed lengthening the school year from 180 days to 220 days, offering voluntary public school education starting at age 3 and testing school-based management, in which teachers and administrators closest to the kids themselves, in the schools, are given the responsibility and the authority to make the decisions to achieve the results we all want for our children.

Mr. President, it is clear that there is plenty of ideas and proposals for innovative school reform percolating up through the system. I am convinced that the best type of school reform has and will come from the local level. Quality school reform should not come top-down from bureaucrats in Washington.

S. 2 can further drive the type of innovative educational reforms that is currently going on in New Jersey schools. The Neighborhood School Grant Program will make funds available to local school districts to develop new approaches to education that are consistent with our national education goals.

The time for talk is over. It is time to enact this legislation, to support reform in our Nation's schools, to move further toward achieving our tough national education goals. Only by meeting those goals can we ensure our future prosperity.

ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS IN S. 2

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I thank the managers of this bill for accepting an amendment that will let this bill serve the purpose for which it is intended: rebuilding our schools.

While we despair that our Nation's schools are not up to the task of educating kids for a competitive world, we in Washington are constantly reminded that the Federal Government's piece of the Nation's school system amounts to only 6 percent. To improve schooling nationwide, we must look for a way to use that piece as the most powerful lever for change at the level of the school and the classroom. That means doing much more than throwing money into school systems.

The bill before us, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, is one response to the guest for a way to use limited Federal resources to make a bigger difference in all 85,000 schools in America. It reaches directly into schools with the means for change and holds schools accountable for results. But in the bill as drafted unfortunately constrains the resources available for change even further because of its excessive allowances for administration and assistance with grant applications. If this bill were fully funded for 5 years, fully 32 percent of the funds would go not to schools but to administrators and grant application professionals. Can we really tell the American people that we are improving American schools when we are putting more than a billion dollars of their money into bloated administrative layers at the State and local level?

The bill as reported allows every State to use its entire first year allotment to develop a State school improvement plan and help schools prepare grant applications. Nearly a decade has passed since Secretary Bell released "A Nation at Risk." Are there really States that have not yet given serious thought to systemwide education reform? If there are such States, and I doubt there are, they need to come to terms with their own economic obligation to themselves, and they should not need a Federal handout to do that planning. This amendment will limit the funds available for first-year planning and grant applications to the $100 million already appropriated. It does not affect the special rule under which States can use first-year funds for teacher training or for public school choice initiatives.

Federal money does not come without responsibilities. States must become partners with the Federal Government and share our commitment to reform. The funds provided under this bill should mesh with the resources forward-looking States are already devoting to school improvement so that everyone's money goes a little further. But as much of this new Federal money as possible must go to making these plans real in each school and each classroom.

Mr. President, this amendment might seem to deal primarily with a technical aspect of this bill. But I intend it to be a first step toward a new principle for the Federal role in education. The principle of accountability must apply at every level. To use the Federal Government's 6 percent of America's school system as a powerful lever for change, we must insist that there will be no more money until there is a commitment to reform. We can use our resources not only as a means for change, but as an incentive for determined, responsive change. We should not use our limited funds for a year of planning, conferring, preparing grant applications and in other ways postponing real reform.

The second step will be a bill I intend to introduce later this spring, which I will call "Rewards-for-Results." I believe we can reach directly into each classroom with a powerful incentive: If your school improves student performance, if students stay in school and come out ready for college or the workforce, we can give every teacher in your school, a $6,000 bonus. This proposal will take some careful thought, but I mention it today because I would like to affirm the principle that we use money to force real reform in school systems that fear change but cry out for the enthusiasm that only change can bring.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to express my deep concerns relating to the education of our country. What we are talking about is the future of America. We cannot set a goal too ambitious for American education, it's the ultimate foundation of our society.

Our world is highly competitive and driven by an increasingly complex international economy. In order to survive in the world economy, we must establish high goals for our students, and then set standards for their achievement. Dedication to the six national education goals as outlined in this legislation puts us on the right track.

This is also the time to be resourceful and innovative. To encourage teachers to seek out new methods which inspire students, their parents and communities. Education is an investment that returns dividends not only to individuals, but to society as a whole.

It is also not a one shot proposition. It must be a lifelong commitment. As old jobs change and new ones are created, we need training programs to maintain a competitive workforce. Maintaining an educated workforce is much easier to do than generating one anew.

We know that an educated workforce is the key to restoring our economic competitiveness. Our success at remaining competitive depends upon a

population that is highly trained and technically literate.

This is particularly true in the areas of science and mathematics, where the global economy demands that each student reach higher levels of competency.

Some States are already working toward this goal. For instance, in my State of Montana, a group involving university level math educators, the Montana Council of Teachers of Mathematics, and the Office of Public Instruction, is working together to design new approaches of teaching math to elementary and secondary students. This is the type of initiative, resourcefulness, and interaction we need to promote across our Nation.

Because of the need to meet these increasing demands for excellence, we cannot afford to decrease funds for public education. We must renew our commitment to investment in education; to the education of every citizen.

To move into the 21st century, all American schools need assistance. We can't pick and choose which schools, or which students, will benefit and which will not. They must all be given the opportunity to achieve their full potential.

Public schools are committed to the education of all Americans and we cannot fail in our support for this commitment. We must all pull together—Federal, State, and local governments—businesses, parents, and communities.

Creating an environment for academic excellence and high standards of educational achievement must be our highest priority. This bill moves us significantly forward in this direction.

"FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON CAMPUS" AMENDMENT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, all of us agree that college students should enjoy the full right of freedom of speech protected by the first amendment. This is a matter of principle that our colleges and universities fully embrace and that no one would question. Senator CRAIG has introduced a freedom of speech on campus amendment which reaffirms the Senate's commitment to assuring that first amendment rights be protected for all members of the university community. This amendment was included in the manager's amendment yesterday and I wanted to describe the purpose of this promotion.

During the past decade there have been increasing reports of sexual, racial and ethnic harassment, and intolerance on college campuses. As student bodies have become more diverse, so too have students' demands for changes in curriculum and campus attitudes regarding multiculturalism and diversity. In 1990, the National Institute Against Prejudice and Violence reported that since 1987 more than 300 college campuses have reported incidents of racial, ethnic, and homosexual harassment. The Justice Department reported more than 100 incidents of racial harassment on college campuses in 1990.

In response to these incidents, a few colleges have issued statements or adopted codes prohibiting racial and sexual harassment and emphasizing the need for civility and tolerance on campus. These codes are modeled after EEOC sexual harassment guidelines for the workplace.

If a code strays too far and violates free speech rights, it should be changed. At the same time, members of the university community cannot be required to tolerate threats of violence or other forms of verbal intimidation and harassment.

In adopting this sense of the Senate amendment, we do not mean in any respect to curtail the right—indeed, the obligation—of college and university officials to promote tolerance and understanding of the diversity of our society. College and university officials should be encouraged to condemn racial, religious or sexual harassment directed at particular members of a college or university community or take disciplinary actions where appropriate. In addition, we do not mean to prevent colleges and universities from taking appropriate measures to protect the rights of speakers on campus against efforts to disrupt their speech by members of a college or university community or by outsiders.

One of the principal goals of our colleges and universities is to advance and disseminate knowledge. To do so, they must promote conditions conducive to teaching, scholarly activity, reasoned and civilized discourse, and a sense of community.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I want to take a moment to offer some comments on the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act.

The question of improving American education ought to be beyond the point of contention. We all agree that something needs to be done. We all agree that the active involvement of many elements in a community, from parents and teachers to community and business leaders, creates a stable foundation for meaningful reform and tells children in that community that everyone is concerned about their education. The question, then, is how can the best of American education reach the broadest number of children and have the greatest impact on today's educational environment. I believe that the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act is an important part of this process.

This bill will place Federal funds at the local level, where they can directly impact the educational needs of children. Few understand the needs of students in schools better than those who live in the communities where the schools are located. Rather than dictating from Washington or from some panel lacking expertise in or sensitivity to the needs of their schools, S. 2 recognizes that teachers, principals, parents and the local community can best devise plans to enhance their schools.

S. 2 also recognizes that any proposal to improve the education of America's children should directly and exclusively benefit public schools. Many of us are no doubt troubled by the studies that indicate that our public schools are places where textbooks and equipment are inadequate, teachers are in short supply and social problems like drugs and violence are finding their way past the schoolyard gate. We are repeatedly told that test results indicate that American students score below their counterparts in Japan and Europe in mathematics and science. Annually, we express concern that SAT scores are declining or at best remain constant. Nevertheless, public schools are the place where communities can decide, for any and every child in the community, what constitutes a comprehensive education. Public schools remain responsible for the education of the vast majority of our children, but more importantly they must answer to the communities they serve.

I am troubled by the idea that public schools are so irredeemable that the only way effectively to reform education and improve educational opportunities for our children is to create new schools or school systems. We must not forget that public schools were created by local governments attempting to address several concerns, including the need for a skilled work force, the value of an educated citizenry and the importance of providing a universal experience for children whose origins may have been very different. Therefore, public elementary and secondary education has been recognized as the responsibility of the State and local governments. The Federal Government has provided and should continue to provide a supportive and coordinating role in public education, offering resource and financial assistance. I believe it would be a mistake to challenge that philosophy by Federal preemption of the State and local government role in determining local education policy. The Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act acknowledges the responsibilities of the Federal, State, and local governments in the area of education and recognizes the importance of maintaining that balance and I enthusiastically support it.

I am also troubled by the idea that public schools are so terrible that the best way to improve the educational opportunities for our children is to provide vouchers to send them to private schools. To spend public money directly or indirectly for programs in schools beyond public accountability, or lacking in a history of educating a

broad array of students, is not the wisest use of precious resources. After all, what will we say to the children if they want and are academically able to continue in a private school, but that school no longer wants to participate in a voucher program or demonstration project?

To those who would claim that the only way to bring substantive reform to education is to create new schools, I would tell them about Albert Holland and the Jeremiah Burke School in Roxbury, MA. This public high school has 750 students. Many of the students are immigrants and do not speak English, nor do they enter school performing work at their grade level. The school does not have a librarian and has only one guidance counselor. The teachers have told me that they sometimes do not have enough books for all of the students in their classes. Despite all of these obstacles, during Al Holland's tenure as headmaster, the percentage of students going on to higher education following graduation has risen from 23 to 65 percent. The Jeremiah Burke School has been transformed into an academic haven for its students. It is not hard to imagine what this school or others like it could accomplish with additional resources.

I also believe it is important to comment on another issue in education not addressed in this bill, yet terribly important. While assistance is provided to the Nation's schools, it is vital that we strengthen the teaching profession. College students should be encouraged to become teachers through a loan forgiveness program. Professionals in other fields, particularly science- and mathematics-related areas, should be able to participate in fellowship programs which bring their expertise into the classroom. Teachers currently in the system should be able to avail themselves of training opportunities for professional development which also benefit their students. Incentives should be provided to bring talented teachers into educationally underserved areas, whether in the inner cities or rural communities. Communities and educators stand ready to bring innovations and reform to many public schools across this country. Teachers are the people who ultimately will make those efforts successful. The Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act correctly addresses the needs of students in our public schools as the initial step toward educational reform. As we move forward in the Senate to consider other educational initiatives, it will be appropriate to address these additional areas of significant concern. The Committee on Labor and Human Resources has included provisions of this sort in the Higher Education bill it has reported for Senate floor action. I look forward to taking up and acting on that bill.

Before closing, I want to commend the Senate's Committee on Labor and Human Resources and its Subcommittee on Education for their work on this bill, and in particular, my colleague, the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], respectively the committee's and the subcommittee's chairmen. They and the committee's and subcommittee's members have labored in earnest to craft the bill before us. They are to be commended for a job well done.

I hope the Senate will give overwhelming support to S. 2 and that it soon will become the law of the land.

Mr. KERREY. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate is considering legislation to provide specific measures to strengthen our education system. It is of vital importance that we target additional education assistance to local schools and school districts that are interested in implementing innovative and far-reaching restructuring.

The current legislation is linked in concept to legislation that I introduced last Congress, the School Restructuring Act of 1990, and similar in focus to my Education Capital Fund legislation that I will be reintroducing in the coming month. If we are truly to "break the mold" and bring about real change, we need to foster the most innovative local proposals that have been developed by dedicated teachers, administrators, parents, business and community leaders.

All over the country change is occurring. Federal officials and politicians should not be trying to favor one reform strategy over another. Rather, we should go to the local communities and offer to work with them on their solutions. We need to offer long-term assistance that recognizes that real reform is not the result of a 1- or 2-year grant, but must be fought for and nurtured over the years. We also need to move beyond a project by project approach by supporting systemic reform. Only systemic reform will allow us to really break the mold and make sure our schools are ready for the 21st century.

We need to go to local school districts and offer assistance in exchange for a commitment to sign a contract that stipulates what performance goals they will agree to achieve.

I am pleased that our educational policy is moving in the direction of supporting local answers to national challenges.

During consideration of this legislation there has also been much discussion of how to remove Federal obstacles to reform. There is a growing sense that educational bureaucracies and vested interests are threatening to stall the growing reform movement. Therefore, I applaud efforts to lighten the regulatory burden so long as we do not undermine the gains we have made in terms of equity and fairness. If we are to succeed in the long run we must ensure that our assistance gets to the students and is not diverted by bureaucrats.

I oppose the proposal offered by Senator HATCH to establish a voucher demonstration program for private and public schools. I do not believe we should divert public funds for private education. Further, the Federal Government should not be advocating particular reform strategies. We need to have faith in local officials, parents, teachers and others and realize that they will come up with appropriate solutions. Our role should be to assist promising solutions, not to choose particular solutions. It would be a grave error for us to go against the grain of our locally controlled educational system.

As we prepared to address these crucial education issues, we should do our own homework. We should increase our own knowledge and awareness of what our children must receive from their schools and how our schools and how our communities might respond by reading three current and most informative books: First, "Smart Schools, Smart Kids," by Edward Fiske, former educational editor for the New York Times; and second, "Savage Inequalities" by Jonathan Kozol, former school teacher and noted education analyst; and third; "Horace's School," by Dr. Ted Sizer, one of the most innovative education reformers in our country.

Passage of S. 2 is not all that is needed to reform our education system. We will need to consider additional steps in the coming year when we turn to reauthorizing the Primary and Secondary Education Act. I also plan to offer legislation next month that will propose a new kind of federal partner and a venture capital fund to assist local efforts. I welcome the continued debate on our Nation's education policy.

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Committee modification of S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act.

I commend the chairman of the Labor and Human Resources Committee for his hard work in developing a proposal that will drive money to schools—not to bureaucracies—to spur real innovation and significant improvement in the schools that need it the most.

The Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act authorizes $850 million, less than the cost of one B-2 bomber, for school-based projects designed to meet the National Education Goals. These grants are designed to leverage real reform. It is a competitive program, in which the schools must design comprehensive plans that will lead to real improvement in measured student achievement, and other progress toward the national education goals.

A portion of the funds may be used by the State for necessary activities

such as teacher training, or experiments with ideas such as new public schools or parental choice among public schools.

This new version of S. 2 incorporates and expands upon many of the ideas that I included in my S. 1371, the Partnerships for Chicago Schools Act. For example, both bills encourage cooperation among the many entities interested in school reform. At the statewide level, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Advisory Council, which works with the State education agency to prepare a reform plan, must be broadly representative of the population of the State, including teachers, school leaders and parents from the neediest schools. At the local level, community-based organizations and local businesses, as well as teachers and parents, must be involved in developing the reform project and application for funds.

Like S. 1371, the comprehensive projects that can be funded include school-based management, teacher training, and parent involvement. Furthermore, a program that works at one school would be shared with others.

While the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act is a significant step forward, there is much more that the Federal Government can and should do to help this Nation meet the national education goals. Title I of the bill details some of the commitments, some of the leadership, that the Congress and the President must show. For example, the goals call for all children to start school ready to learn by the year 2000. But the Nation's best hope for meeting this goal, the highly successful Head Start Program, does not come close to serving all of the eligible children. On school dropout prevention, student achievement, science and math, violence and drugs, and teacher training and recruitment, programs are cited as vehicles for making real progress toward goals that have so far been 99 percent rhetoric.

Finally, Mr. President, if we are to succeed in achieving the national education goals, we must have better information about where we are, where to go, and how to get there. My colleague from New Mexico [Mr. BINGAMAN] has been relentless in his effort to ensure that the national goals panel be without partisan tilt and provided with the resources to do a good job. I am pleased that over the past few weeks the administration and the Governors have consented to some changes in the goals panel to achieve this end.

Mr. President, we have heard enough words about the need to spur innovation and improvement in our neighborhood schools. This bill is more than words, it means action. I urge my colleagues to support S. 2, and to oppose efforts to weaken its commitment to the improvement of neighborhood public schools.

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, when the Bush administration first submitted its America 2000 plan for educational reform, the Democrats willingly offered to both sponsor and craft a bipartisan proposal for improving academic achievement. But after little more than a cursory review of school choice and other administration goals, those same Democrats who touted their cooperative spirit soon walked away from the bargaining table. While the administration sought compromise, the Democrats worked only among themselves and bulldozed an education bill through the Labor Committee. Today we will vote on that same educational agenda which lacks any semblance to the President's proposal. The administration negotiated in good faith; the Democrats assumed that if we were willing to bargain that they were right and we were wrong.

Mr. President, this has happened time and time again. It happened with the 1990 budget agreement. It happened with the Clean Air Act and it happened with the civil rights bill. This education bill proves once again that any attempt to forge a bipartisan compromise on important issues will be purged in favor of bureaucracy and unions; job creation, economic or educational reforms will be sacrificed at the political altar.

Yet the Democrats brought their own education bill to the floor knowing full well the administration would seek to restore some of its America 2000 initiatives. And once again, the Democrats claimed their willingness to bargain on private school choice and New American Schools amendments. But, Mr. President, let us not be fooled. The New American School provision omits a competitive funding program to include private schools and our efforts to permit merely a demonstration project for private school choice were soundly defeated. But why?

Many members on the other side contend that we should not divert taxpayer dollars away from the public schools; that the public schools are in trouble and need our help. The chairman of the Labor Committee asserts that anyone who pays taxes should only send their child to public school; it is public taxpayers' money. Mr. President, that is exactly the point. All taxpayers should have the choice to use their tax dollars to send their child to a school they desire, public or private, when the education value of that child is the issue. Clearly when NEA power is the issue, the interest of the child is not.

Yet under this version of S. 2, parents of low-income children will be denied a chance to be involved and held accountable for their choices in education. Education begins at home. Parents instill discipline and responsibility in their children and more often than not parents are the first to teach their children how to read and write and discern right from wrong.

But those same parents will not be allowed further responsibility in deciding how or where to develop the knowledge, curiosity, and imagination of their children. And those children have lost a tremendous opportunity to test a choice program which could have made great improvements in our educational system. Are we as a governing body so arrogant as to think that we know more about what is best for the education of children than their parents?

The U.S. population census recently found that public school teachers enroll their kids in private schools at over twice the rate of the national average. In fact, 46 percent of Chicago public school teachers enroll their children in private schools, 33 percent in Washington, DC, and 30 percent in Atlanta compared to 16 percent of the general population. One can only assume that public school teachers know something the Senate refuses to know. Yet other parents are denied the same choice.

The opponents of private school choice argue that Federal funding for education has declined and our public school system has suffered as a result. Mr. President, that is simply not true. We spend 33 percent more per pupil in 1991 than we did in 1981, yet we have seen little, if any, real improvement in school performance. The Labor Committee chairman would have us believe that Chapter 2 funding could be used by any State to develop a voucher system for valuable educational programs. But what he fails to point out is that same Chapter 2 funding is only for public schools.

So I ask my colleagues, what was the real reason for defeating a $30 million school choice demonstration project? Two words come to mind. Excellence and innovation. But obviously those on the other side of the aisle only seek to control reform and along with it the pursestrings. That kind of educational leadership benefits no one but the special interest establishment.

Mr. President, I cannot support S. 2 in its present form. It is, as President Bush has said, "business as usual." Under S. 2, most schools will receive only $1,000 more a year to develop the so-called Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act. This small sum is intended to be used to implement significant, comprehensive, schoolwide changes in the structure or programs of each school. My guess is that those funds will only be used to cover administrative costs and, once again, we will see little real academic achievement from our Nation's public schools. So with that the Democrats are attempting to make a big political splash, but our children will get no education bang. We are throwing good money after bad and the innovative educational goals of this administration

have gone out the window with them. But more importantly, we have ignored some of the most basic principles upon which this Nation was founded—the exercise of fundamental freedoms and the promotion of the public welfare.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to support the legislation before us, which will further our national efforts toward education reform. This bill is one of several steps necessary to ensure that the children of today are prepared to meet the challenges of the 21st century and enhance our Nation's status in the global marketplace.

It is clear, Mr. President, that our educational system needs substantial rejuvenation—in terms of both resources and ideas. This bill will provide much-needed resources to existing public schools and State education agencies so that they can institute the reform measures that would be most effective in their areas. These funds will be welcomed at a time when most local school systems are facing budget cuts at the State level. When funds are scarce, the most immediate needs take priority, and few education dollars are left for ambitious new reforms. I hope these new Federal funds will provide States and local schools with the resources they need to brainstorm and implement innovative approaches to elementary and secondary education.

I am also pleased that the Senate has grasped this opportunity to provide leadership in offering incentives to States and local schools to develop fresh, new approaches to education. The status quo is not working anymore—few Americans will dispute that fact.

A major step toward reversing this downward trend was taken when the Senate endorsed the New American Schools originally envisioned by President Bush in his America 2000 proposal. The idea of creating break the mold, start from scratch schools has certainly caught on in my home State of Maine, where the Commissioner of Education, school teachers and administrators, parents, and business leaders alike have raised their voices in support of this new approach.

I have heard from several public school teachers and administrators in Maine who are eager to apply for these funds so that they can begin a wholesale education reform effort in their communities. The interest is certainly there at the local level, and I am pleased that the Senate has given those schools the opportunity to apply for these grants and to begin that process.

The New American Schools proposal is precisely the kind of forward-thinking boost that the Federal Government ought to provide to our Nation's educational system. I think that we should continue to pursue means to get at the very root causes of some our schools' problems, however, as money is not the only solution.

Parental participation in a child's education, for example, is an invaluable component of our national education system. A child that has not had the benefit of parental attention to his or her physical, emotional, intellectual, and moral development comes to school with a distinct disadvantage. Our schools cannot be expected to enact radical reforms when they are burdened with equalizing the learning levels of children in the earliest school years. Senator BOND's parents as teachers bill, which I cosponsored, would have been a very appropriate addition to this legislation, and I hope that we will have the opportunity to pursue this issue at another time. Senator BOND's legislation would help parents learn the valuable skills they will need as parents, and indeed, as their child's first teacher.

The Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act that the Senate has adopted today is an important step in what will be a long road toward true education reform. I am pleased to support its passage.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, I will vote for this sense-of-the-Senate, to take Defense funds for schools, but I do not want it to become nonsense. I do not want to see us bashing the military. Everyone expects the military to be cut, and it ought to be. But cuts should not be made too quickly and recklessly or without considering that this is a big country with huge defense responsibilities. In looking at our history, it is all too obvious each of our previous military build downs after World War I, World War II, Korea, and Vietnam respectively, were too extreme. The price we often paid for that was in lives, the lives of our service men and women.

We will have military cuts. I believe part of the funds from those cuts must be used to get the massive debt under control. Certainly some savings should be invested in education, science, and other programs. We must remember spending on educational and science programs are also an investment in our military infrastructure. The men and women of Desert Storm operated the most sophisticated military equipment in the world. They are better educated and motivated than any force in our Nation's history. Nearly 100 percent of our active duty military personnel have completed high school while only 75 percent of Americans are high school graduates.

Our priorities must remain on the recruitment and retention of the best men and women to serve in uniform. The equipment they use and train with must also be the best. A military build down will come. The cost should not be the lessening, to any degree, of our military capabilities to meet the future needs of and threats to our national security.

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, we have all heard the reports about the state of our Nation's education system. Studies show that our high school graduates often lack the skills necessary to obtain entry level employment, and more alarmingly, that our students lag behind those of other nations in math and science ability. These two areas are crucial to the success of our Nation in the global marketplace.

As painful as these observations are, they have led us to direct tremendous energy toward reforming and improving our schools. S. 2, the bill before us now, would create a 10-year program of grants to States to assist local school districts and individual schools in implementing comprehensive reform. While I agree that appropriate funding is necessary for education initiatives, this is an ambitious program to embark upon when several proven education programs now in existence are not adequately funded to serve all eligible students.

The measure, however, does incorporate new ideas, such as New American Schools and regulatory flexibility, and it provides a basis for further discussion on education reform. For this reason, I am supporting S. 2, but not without reservation. It still requires much work. The House has not completed action on its version of the bill, which differs considerably from S. 2. Then a conference committee must reconcile difference between the two measures. So while I am supporting S. 2, my vote today does not ensure my vote for the conference agreement. Let us see what final emerges. Then I can make a final judgment on its merits.

THE NICKLES LEARNFARE AMENDMENT

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, the objective behind Senator NICKLES' Learnfare amendment is commendable. I think that no one in this body would dispute the need for parental involvement and personal responsibility as essential for any meaningful progress to be made whether it be in education or welfare dependency or the war on drugs.

Senator MOYNIHAN will be holding hearings on February 3 in the Finance Committee to examine issues similar to those raised by this amendment. Our States are laboratories for innovations to bring constructive changes in the welfare system and it is my understanding that Senator MOYNIHAN's purpose is to learn about the new ideas and directions which States are looking at to make modifications in the AFDC Program. I think the Federal Government as a partner is the AFDC system with the States can work with the States to develop and implement new model programs. In this way we can proceed in a thoughtful manner to improve our welfare system and strive to assist the beneficiaries of the system in ending welfare dependency and achieving educational attainment.

We should not impede progress in this area. I believe our States—on the front line in the management and de-

livery of services—will be sensitive to the special needs of dysfunctional families, a concern which Senator KOHL raised. We can learn from the experiences in our States. I support the amendment of Senator NICKLES.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, in the last week, we have heard a lot about education reform, accountability, innovation, and flexibility. However, the result of all that talk has produced a bill which is a less innovative approach to education than we would have had if more of the President's proposals had been included.

This bill authorizes a block grant, a Republican concept, which allows States to use funding for a variety of activities. I basically agree with that approach. The bill also recognizes that change will occur school by school, which is something each of us understands is necessary.

However, although the bill incorporates some of the President's program, it does not include all of the major reforms he sought. And, those Presidential initiatives that did find their way into this bill were significantly watered down from the original proposal.

The compromise on New American Schools allows States to use up to 25 percent for this purpose. While this compromise is much less than President Bush's original proposal, I think it is essential that this program is in the bill.

Many have mocked President Bush's goal of being the education President. All I can say to my colleagues is that at least this President has a vision for the future of education. That vision includes New American Schools. New American Schools are what our schools can become. They are the cornerstone of America 2000, a forward-looking program which helps us improve schools one community at a time. Too slow, some may say, but Mr. President, deliberate change and thoughtful innovation is better than no change and no innovation. New American Schools represents an opportunity for parents, educators, business, and community leaders to create the schools of the future. I commend all of my colleagues, on both sides of the aisles for allowing this program to go forward, at least in part.

This program can help every State, and I am pleased that this new program will be available to Utah. My home State has never been afraid of trying something different. Utah is currently experimenting with nine model high schools, incorporating vocational educational with academic training. A lot of effort is being focused on these schools.

A compromise was also reached on education flexibility to allow 50 districts in each of 6 States to have more flexibility in administering Federal programs. If schools are to change and meet student needs, they must have the flexibility to meet the needs of students and teachers. This bill allows States to have this flexibility. Utah has already made strides in education flexibility by removing restrictions on State funds. This started as a pilot program with six districts and has expanded to all districts. This increased flexibility at the Federal level will help Utah in its efforts to serve our students better.

I appreciate the incorporation of some of the concepts of New American Schools and educational flexibility into S. 2. However, I am disappointed the Senate failed to approve a very modest choice demonstration project. The choice amendment provided low-income families with an alternative in education while giving us the opportunity to evaluate the effects, both positive and negative, of including private schools in a choice program. I believe it was very shortsighted for the Senate to reject this demonstration.

We should study all options that may result in improved schools both public and private. Rhetoric doesn't appear to have changed a significant number of inner city schools in the last 10 years. My amendment did not incorporate wide-sweeping changes; it funded only six demonstration projects. I believe my amendment held the potential for real reform if the demonstration proved successful. But, the message this body sent when it voted down the choice demonstration amendment was a simple one: "Let's not experiment with choice because it might work, and that would rock the boat."

I am also sorry that we did not change the Chapter 1 formula. While I am grateful for the willingness of both Senators PELL and KENNEDY to review this issue more carefully as we move into the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary School Education Act, I want to reiterate how important this issue is to the 28 States whose low-income children are somehow worth less than low-income children in other States.

This must be the congressional new math. I look forward to correcting this formula problem very soon.

I had hoped that we could have achieved more in this bill. I personally believe it is time we in Congress look at some bold, break-the-mold approaches in education. This bill falls short of such reforms, but at least the compromises in New American Schools and education flexibility are a small step in the right direction. I hope that in the future we can implement more of the President's ideas so that we can motivate and empower our communities to create educational systems that truly meet the needs of all our children.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, I rise in support of final passage of S. 2 as amended, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act.

As I pointed out as we began this debate, it is an important and powerful statement about priorities in this country that legislation designed to improve the quality of American education is the Senate's first order of business in this second session of the 102d Congress.

I want to commend the senior Senator from Massachusetts for his leadership in bringing this legislation to the floor and for his patience and willingness to consider several important amendments which are now a part of this bill.

The biggest single improvement in this legislation is that it now allows up to 25 percent of funds States will receive to help start new schools.

I strongly believe that an essential component of real education reform in this country must be the design and implementation of new, more diverse, and more individually tailored sites for teaching and learning.

This legislation now gives States additional resources to make that happen, including the establishment of the kind of break-the-mold New American Schools first proposed by President Bush and Education Secretary Lamar Alexander in the President's America 2000 initiative.

I am especially pleased, Mr. President, that this legislation now allows charter public schools—as authorized in Minnesota and being considered in a number of other States—to receive startup funding.

I want to again thank the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts for his willingness to add language that allows States to use up to 10 percent of their block grant to help establish new public schools, including charter schools.

I am also pleased that an amendment was adopted allowing an additional 15 percent of each State's block grant to be used for New American Schools as originally proposed by President Bush. The language used to define New American Schools in this amendment makes it possible, in Minnesota at least, that these could be charter schools or schools initiated by public school districts.

Finally, Mr. President, I am pleased that language has been added to S. 2 that specifically authorizes States to use a portion of their block grant for student assessment and parent information and referral programs. In Minnesota such a program is now being developed—called School Choice Advisor—that will help both parents and students make better informed school choices.

Having made those observations about improvements in S. 2, I must also say that I am still disappointed that the legislation before us bears so little resemblance to the America 2000 initiative unveiled by President Bush and Secretary Alexander last May

while they were visiting the Saturn School in St. Paul.

I have spoken several times during this debate about the educational innovations and achievements that have emerged from my own State of Minnesota. And, I am pleased that several of those innovations are now eligible for funding under S. 2.

Education reform has come as far as it has in Minnesota, Mr. President, because Minnesota has been a source of many good ideas for improving teaching and learning.

But, education reform is also succeeding in Minnesota because it has been bipartisan.

We can learn from that experience, Mr. President. And, I am hopeful that before this legislation becomes law at least some of the inspiration and good ideas we saw from President Bush and Secretary Alexander last spring will become part of a very needed statement of national support for new schools—and for better ways of teaching and learning—all across America.

I yield the floor.

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. President, today we are considering one of the most important bills that will come before the Congress this year, S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act. This legislation takes important steps to strengthen education in this country.

No one questions the importance of a strong educational system for America's future. Since the end of World War II the world has undergone radical and dynamic changes—the disintegration of military powers like the former Soviet Union and the birth of economic powers like Japan and Germany. Overall, democracy has caught fire and spread around the world making way for the development of a global community. America's role in this transformed community of nations has also changed as new and pressing domestic needs challenge our economic strength and position in world leadership.

For the America of today, it is essential to concentrate our efforts on keeping our country strong and competitive. A strong educational system must be a fundamental part of this effort. Only by making high-quality education available to all American children will we help them to develop the skills they need to find meaningful, high-wage jobs, while developing a capable and productive work force that is essential to the economic future of this country. There are many pieces to this; we must make sure children are ready for school, that they are fed and healthy, and we must work to keep our children motivated so they stay in school, as well as provide them with the best possible education.

A Federal commitment to education is essential to this effort. Despite a lot of rhetoric from the White House on the importance of education, however, we haven't seen much real leadership on making this commitment. Over the last decade for example, Congress has consistently appropriated more to educational programs than Republican administrations have requested.

We need to encourage innovation in educational programs, as well as cooperation among school districts and the communities they serve. It is estimated that U.S. companies must spend $30 billion a year on remedial education for their employees. By the end of the decade, people with less than a high school diploma will be able to fill only 14 percent of all jobs, as compared with 40 percent today. Innovation is necessary to make the system stronger and more effective. Funding is key to improving education. The President implicitly acknowledged this when he proposed to spend $535 million on New American Schools. I support efforts to improve education but I strongly believe that all schools should be able and encouraged to participate in this effort, not just a few select schools across the country.

There has been much debate about so-called choice programs to allow parents to select which school their children will attend. And several States including Michigan are experimenting with choice proposals. Choice programs, as they are called, are supposed to force schools to improve their performance as a result of competition. But problems arise when private schools are included. Public and private schools don't really compete on an even basis. Private schools, unlike public schools, can refuse to accept students with disabilities or discipline problems and are not subjected to the same requirements as public schools. Frankly, the President's broad choice proposal is not much different than the old educational voucher proposal with a new name.

As a cosponsor of the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act I believe this legislation takes much-needed action to improve America's educational system. Through this kind of comprehensive approach we will enhance student performance, strengthen literacy programs, improve math and science and work toward drop-out prevention. The bill strengthens proven, cost-effective educational programs that will rejuvenate our educational system and better prepare America's children and youth for today's rapidly changing world.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, we have known of the disrepair in our public school system for over a decade. We have known of the importance of innovative reforms in our public schools. We have known what works in educating our children.

Too often, however, we have failed to implement the needed reforms. Not because of a lack of will, but because of a lack of means. We have not provided our teachers and our schools with the resources they need to reach the goals we set for them.

The role of our educational system is taking on greater importance. Education is a cornerstone of our democracy and a basic ingredient of American prosperity. The modern international marketplace demands an exceptionally productive and competitive work force. We cannot afford to allow the potential of even one of our citizens to remain underdeveloped. It is not an act of charity; it is an act of economic necessity.

Will we in America rise to the challenge that has been set by economic competitors such as Japan and Germany? Will we commit to making all schools good schools, or will reparable faults remain? Will we provide equal educational opportunities, or will we allow a dual system to develop—one for the richest and brightest students and another for everyone else?

Our Nation will not and cannot abandon our public schools. But, our citizens cannot be expected to blindly support failed solutions or old systems. Yes, the public schools need more money. But, the public school of today is operating in a climate that has dramatically changed.

When I was in school, the divorce rate was not 56 percent; 57 percent of American women were not working outside the home; there were not 1.9 million kids living with no parent; one in six teenagers were not taking illegal drugs; and one in five children did not live in poverty. The landscape has changed, and so must public education. The challenges facing students, parents, and teachers are different than they were just a generation ago.

What we need, then, are new approaches—solutions that will prepare America's children for the 21st century; solutions for the technological age, not for the agricultural age. We need longer school years, magnet schools, site-based management, parental involvement in the schools, and reduction in class sizes. These are innovative reforms I have long supported and are reforms that will improve the education of American children.

That is what S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, seeks to do, and I am pleased to support this legislation. This bill provides $850 million to the States to assist reform efforts in local schools. Not for old ideas, but for innovative reform at individual schools.

That point needs to be underscored. Experience has proven that decisions on education policies are most responsive and efficient when made by local communities. Under S. 2, the reform will take place at the local school level. Each school—whether urban or rural, big or small—will be able to adopt those reforms that will best meet the needs of the students at that school.

The final version of this bill includes a modified proposal from the adminis-

tration regarding new American schools. New American schools is a good idea—providing seed money for new, innovative, break-the-mold schools that will prepare our children for the future. However, I had concerns about the original proposal that came before us, and I want to commend my colleagues for fashioning a compromise that allowed the new American schools proposal to be included as part of the bill.

Let us not be under the false notion, however, that new American schools is the only innovation in this bill. S. 2 is not, as some claim, business as usual. The legislation the Senate has crafted is a good bill for our Nation's schools and for America's children.

Much of the debate on this bill has focused on the issue of school choice—in this version, allowing parents to send their kids to private schools at public expense. Senator HATCH offered an amendment to create a $30 million, six-site private school choice demonstration project. I support the underlying concept of school choice, but Senator HATCH'S amendment varied too far from the approach I would support.

Innovative proposals for reform have often come from the private schools in this country. My concern, however, is that public resources should be targeted toward reform in public schools. Public schools are not being adequately funded and have not been provided the resources to carry out reform. We must focus on improving our public schools, which educate the vast majority—nearly 90 percent—of our Nation's children.

Education, or the lack of it, is something that we all know can help set the individual free or consign him or her to a lifetime of uphill battles. As a nation, the quality of our educational system can make us a world leader or relegate us to second class status. Our Nation is making a commitment to upgrading our educational system. And, passing S. 2 will be a good step toward providing a high quality education to all of America's children. This is not an easy task, and there are not simple solutions. But, the road to reform has begun. With the support of the American public, we can restore our educational system to a position of world leadership.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, there is no question that education reform has emerged as one of the top policy issues facing us in 1992. As a cosponsor of S. 2 the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, I believe this bill is a first step toward identifying the important role the Federal Government has in the education reform movement.

This bill outlines the Federal Government's commitment to our public schools, by providing seed money to local educators willing to implement comprehensive schoolwide education reform. S. 2 sets six national educational goals and targets the year 2000 to reach them. The bill mandates that States devise a comprehensive education reform plan that will help achieve the national education goals. One of the most important aspects of this legislation is that individual schools design their own programs and submit proposals they think will improve academic achievement in their area. This gives States and communities the key decisionmaking role, not the Federal Government. Accountability is ensured as continued funding of the programs is based on progress toward the national education goals.

An amendment to S. 2 that I was prepared to offer was essentially the same as S. 685, the Summer Residential Science Academy Act, which I introduced along with Senator HATFIELD of Oregon. Respecting the request of the Labor and Human Resources Committee to not add new programs to S. 2, I did not offer the amendment.

It should be said, however, that until programs are designed that create systemic change in how we educate our children, our national goals and standards will remain unmet. Underrepresentation of women and minorities in fields related to science and mathematics and engineering is a problem of critical importance. We can no longer afford to underutilize our human resources if we wish to remain competitive in global economy.

The Summer Residential Science Academy Act would address the historical underrepresentation of minorities and women in scientific and engineering careers by providing additional hands-on training for female and minority 7th through 12th graders. The program would stress the multiyear program support and multiyear participation of students that would enhance the students science and mathematics education increase the chances of the selection of a mathematics, science or engineering career choice. I hope that the committee will favorably report S. 625 in the near future.

I have opposed the administration's amendments to this bill which would divert scarce Federal dollars from our public schools. I was glad to see that the private school choice demonstration project was not included in this bill. If this amendment were adopted students could attend private, religiously affiliated schools at taxpayers expense. I have consistently opposed attempts by Congress to encourage the use of Federal funds to support public funds to nonpublic education, whether in the form of tuition tax credits, vouchers, or now parental choice. This provision would have been the first step toward establishing a permanent, voucher program.

We have a system of public education in this country that is available to all children. If this educational system is not producing the high level of achievement this Nation now needs, we cannot abandon them, but rather find ways to make improvements. I believe that the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, is a stronger proposal than the administration's America 2000, for beginning the necessary reform of education in this country.

LEARNFARE AMENDMENT

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to talk about the Learnfare amendment. I believe that the concept of Learnfare is a good one. Like many of my collegues, I believe there should be some connection between government support and individual responsibility.

The idea of Learnfare is a good one, namely to tie a child's school attendance to a family's receipt of AFDC money. There is no question that the longer a child stays in school, the less likely that child is to become welfare dependent in the future. A high school diploma can play a major role in breaking the cycle of dependency, and we should do all we can to encourage children to pursue education.

However, I voted against this amendment because I am concerned that any punitive measures taken against a family be linked to increased social services. Very often truant children live in dysfunctional families where there are a variety of problems. If we are going to penalize these families for not keeping their children in school, we should also ensure that we do everything possible to provide the family and the child with the services they need to get them back in school.

That is the purpose of the waiver program, to tie the sanctions to social services. So, the families may lose something, but they get something in return. By keeping the waiver program intact, I think the Learnfare Program will be more constructive for the families. After all, our goal is not to punish families, but to help them.

WIRTH AMENDMENT TO S. 2

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, although I have been a consistent supporter of funding for education and job training programs over the years, I could not support the narrow focus of the Wirth amendment to S. 2. This amendment was a sense of the Senate that the 1990 budget agreement should be realigned to certain programs. As much as we need those programs, there are other vital areas—health, housing, the homeless, substance abuse programs, the environment, deficit reduction and tax reduction which deserve attention.

It should be noted that on September 10, 1991, I voted in favor of an amendment to waive the Budget Act for consideration of the Harkin amendment, which would have increased budget authority by $3.148 billion for a broad array of education, health and human service programs. This amendment also

shifted funds from defense to domestic accounts.

Mr. President, I was not prepared to take up such an important issue at this time, without following the appropriate process. In my view, this issue should be considered by the Budget and Appropriations Committees, so that the Senate can develop a plan for the equitable distribution of savings realized through reductions in defense spending.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, inquiry, has the Peace Corps amendment been accepted? Have we completed final action on that particular modification?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Peace Corps amendment was modified. The modification was agreed to.

Mr. KENNEDY. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, our action on the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act is the first of what I hope will be several successful steps by the Senate this year to lay the proper Federal groundwork for improving education and revitalizing the Nation's schools. Our schools are primarily a State and local responsibility, but Federal leadership is essential, too, and it has been significantly and continuously lacking in recent years.

In the past decade the Federal share of spending on education has fallen by a third. Our failure to invest in early childhood development, education and job training has had severe consequences. A third of the Nation's children, as many as 2 million students a year, do not enter school ready to learn.

Two-thirds of the recent high school graduates lack essential skills to move into the work force. If we neglect our schools, we undermine our future. S. 2, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act, is a giant step on the road back. It authorizes $850 million in fiscal year 1992, and such sums as may be necessary in future years to help struggling schools across the country to improve themselves and restore American elementary and secondary public education to the eminence they deserve.

There are five key features of the legislation. It will help thousands of local schools to improve academic achievement and not just 535. The schools that will receive the assistance will be picked by State officials, not by the Federal Secretary of Education.

For the first time strict accountability requirements are included. To retain their funding schools must show progress in the achievement of their students. Only public schools are funded. We rejected, for good reason, the deeply fought notion that Federal aid to private schools should be the heart of our Federal efforts to improve the public schools.

Above all, the proposals for reform will be developed at the level of the local school. Teachers, school leaders, parents, members of the community will participate in the process of designing and implementing the plan that will best meet their local needs. There is no one-size-fits-all model for education reform. The greatest strength is in our diversity, and out of our great diversity will emerge a new greatness for American Education.

Finally, I want to commend my colleagues who played a special role in achieving this success. I thank in particular my friends and colleagues Senator HATCH, Senator KASSEBAUM, Senator COCHRAN, who have very much been involved in the floor debate, as they have in the course of our committee deliberations, Senator JEFFORDS, and others, who have been involved in the substance and shaping of the legislation and who have been extremely helpful as we address some of the amendments.

I am deeply obligated to Senator PELL who is the chairman of the Education Subcommittee and has done more in shaping and fashioning certainly higher education than any of our Members and we thank him for all of the efforts. Also, other members of our committee: Senator SIMON, Senator METZENBAUM, Senator DODD, Senator HARKIN, Senator BARBARA MIKULSKI, Senator BINGAMAN, who had a key role in shaping the goals panel. All of them have been of great help and assistant in shaping the legislation.

I want to thank in particular our staffs for all of their help and assistance, and thank the majority leader for scheduling this legislation as the first order of business. It is the first order of business, I think, for millions of American families. I welcome the opportunity and the cooperation we have received from all of the Members to be able to get to this issue, voted on and resolved early in this session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kansas.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I think that one goal we all share Mr. President, in S. 2 is the improvement of our Nation's elementary and secondary schools. That is what unites us.

This is a point made by an editorial in this morning's Washington Post, which noted that specific controversies regarding this bill "merely marks a more widespread agreement: It's time to reach down to specific school districts and even to individual schools." The editorial goes on to point out that the President deserves great credit for keeping up "steady beat for reform," and—indeed—he does. This bill reflects in many ways a number of initiatives the President has been encouraging, and I believe that is one of the real strengths of this bill.

In the course of the debate on S. 2, several modifications have been made in the bill, and I would like to take a moment to highlight a few of them.

First of all, I am pleased that S. 2 now incorporate some of the reform proposals put forward by President Bush in the areas of New American Schools and education flexibility. I believe that both offer great possibilities. I would particularly like to thank Senator COCHRAN for his work with respect to including New American Schools activities in S. 2. Under the agreement reached, States which want to establish New American Schools may apply to the Secretary of Education for authority to waive the requirement that 90 percent of their funding allotment be distributed directly to neighborhood schools. Under the waiver authority, up to 25 percent of the allotment could be retained for the development of New American Schools.

This provision permits States which wish to do so to develop New American Schools. Across the Nation, hundreds of communities have begun the process by committing themselves to being America 2000 communities. Likewise, 31 States have embraced the goals of America 2000. Given the enthusiastic reception thus far on the part of States and localities across the country, I feel that many will want to pursue the option of creating New American Schools.

The bill also incorporates a proposal championed by Senator HATFIELD which would allow local education agencies to waive Federal regulations which impede the ability of teachers to focus on providing the best possible education for their students. This proposal puts teachers back in the decisionmaking role of deciding how best to teach their students.

During last year's Teachers and Principals of the Year hearing held by the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources, several teachers testified to the need to provide greater flexibility. Certainly, many Federal regulations are necessary and important. At the same time, teachers should not have to spend their time interpreting Federal regulations or figuring out how to work within their confines if they are actually a hindrance to good education practice.

One problem is that regulations are written for each separate Federal program, and the interaction among them is not always considered. Another problem is that not all school or teachers operate the same way, serve the same types of populations, or have the same problems in their communities. Our teachers, principals, and district superintendents are in a position where they can identify the problems with the regulations. This provision puts them in a position where they can do something about the problems as well.

The bill also makes a start toward dealing with the issues of educational standards and testing, which have been the subject of much discussion over the past year. It provides authority for the continuation of the State National Assessment of Educational Progress [NAEP] trial program, due to expire this year. That authority is needed at this time in order to permit advance planning for any future trials which Congress may authorize as part of legislation reauthorization the Office of Educational Research and Improvement [OERI].

Providing the authority and lead-time to continue these trials will allow for a more complete evaluation of the uses of and interest in such trend data by participating States. Such an expansion also will provide the data Congress needs to help evaluate the feasibility, foresee the impact, and estimate the cost of a fully implemented State NAEP before we decide to move past the trial stage.

In addition, S. 2 adopts the recommendations of the National Council on Standards and Testing for starting a process by which broader questions of standards and testing can be addressed. I would emphasize, however, that this is the beginning of this discussion—not the end point.

If we are moving in the direction of developing national standards, we must have broad debate and consensus on what those standards should be. Teachers must have a major role in the development of the standards, they are the ones who will be implementing the standards by turning them into curricula and helping students meet the standards. They must be closely involved from the start of this process if we want to see wide-scale adoption of the standards.

As for the development of a national test, many difficult questions deserving of broad public debate remain. I continue to believe it would be a mistake to rush headlong into some type of national test or system of tests. We must be satisfied that such assessment is worth the time, effort, and money which would be involved.

As a matter of common sense, we must also make sure that we allow adequate time for teachers and students to adapt to and be exposed to new standards and any resulting new curricula before we implement tests on them. Otherwise, we will have spent a lot of money to develop another test that shows our students performing poorly. If we choose to develop some type of national test or system of tests, I believe that the primary goal of the test or tests should be to improve teaching and learning and inform teachers and students. The Federal role should be one of informing the debate on assessment practices and supporting the local efforts.

With respect to school choice, I am disappointed that the Senate passed up the opportunity to create a small demonstration program which would have allowed us to get some solid information regarding the actual effects of school choice. The debate over choice will be both endless and pointless until such information is available to us.

Finally, the bill before us preserves the basic block grant structure which recognizes the key role which States play in education and education reform. Likewise, it maintains provisions designed to strengthen neighborhood schools. That, I believe, is a particularly important focus.

In conclusion, Mr. President, the real answers in education will be found outside Washington. I have strongly believed this, I suppose because of my days as a local school board member and my involvement with tutoring and various other programs at the local level. It is my hope, however, and I believe it is the case, that this legislation will be of assistance in the search for solutions by encouraging States and localities to seek improvements of local schools and to think boldly in terms of reform. That is what I believe S. 2 is all about, and it is on that basis that I strongly offer my support for S. 2.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I know we are prepared to move to final passage, but I do want to mention the members of the staff on all sides that were very, very helpful. On our committee staff, Nick Littlefield, Terry Hartle, Suzanne Ramos, and Rusty Barbour. On Senator PELL's staff, David Evans and Ann Young. On Senator MITCHELL's staff, John Hilley and Kim Wallace. For Senator HATCH, Laurie Chivers. Senator KASSEBAUM might want to mention some.

Mrs. KASSEBAUM. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts. I would like to thank all the staff members involved with this bill. Many on both sides worked long hours to move this legislation through the process. On the Republican side, I would particularly like to thank Susan Hattan, Lisa Ross, and Sondra Nickel of my staff, Laurie Chivers and Corine Larson with Senator HATCH, Doris Dixon with Senator COCHRAN, Pam Kruse with Senator JEFFORDS, Rolf Lund and Carolyn Boos with Senator DURENBERGER, Kent Talbert with Senator THURMOND, and Alison Carroll with Senator COATS.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, also I thank Adele Robinson for Senator ADAMS, Bob Shireman for Senator SIMON, Ray Ramirez for Senator BINGAMAN, Bev Schroeder for Senator HARKIN, Joan Gilman for Senator DODD, and Cheryl Birdsall for Senator METZENBAUM. Also a group of interns in the Labor Committee: Dan Ivey-Soto, Hector De LaTorre, Tom Clyde, Lauren Burke, Joe Murray, Katherine Herrera, Heather McGuire, Meeghan Punty, and some interns: Kevin Martin, Wendy Bloom, Kate Scurria, and Nevla O'Connor. These last four were students who came for a period of 3 weeks, enormously talented and creative young people who just came down here at the right time, doing a lot of research, particularly about what was happening out in local communities. I thought they made a very important contribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, mentioning the staff causes me to rise to make a comment or two that I would like to extend in comments for the RECORD on one of the more interesting contributions to this bill that we did not vote on, the adoption of charter education. The chairman was good enough to pick that up. Senator LIEBERMAN and I both sponsored it.

I want to thank Terry Hartle particularly for his understanding in the period of time from markup to now of how important this kind of choice in public education is going to be in the future and to thank Carolyn Boos of my staff and particularly a young man who has three children, ages 3, 6, and 9, out in Minnesota by the name of Jon Schroeder who put this thing together, worked with the Democrats, the legislature, the State of Minnesota over the last 22 years to make this a reality. It is one of the contributions that people on our home staffs who are not here in Washington every day with us can make for the future of their children and the children of all Americans. I thank the Chair and ranking member.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I should have mentioned Senator DURENBERGER on this particular issue as well, and I thank him for bringing it up.

Mr. President, I have an amendment to the title. I understand it is appropriate at this time that it be the complete title to the legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the title is in order after the bill has been passed.

Is there further debate on the bill? If not, the bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall the bill, as amended, pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the role.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. FORD. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HARKIN] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 92, nays 6, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 9 Leg.]

YEAS—92

Adams	Exon	Mikulski
Akaka	Ford	Mitchell
Baucus	Fowler	Moynihan
Bentsen	Glenn	Murkowski
Biden	Gore	Nickles
Bingaman	Gorton	Nunn
Bond	Graham	Packwood
Boren	Gramm	Pell
Bradley	Grassley	Pressler
Breaux	Hatch	Pryor
Brown	Hatfield	Reid
Bryan	Heflin	Riegle
Bumpers	Hollings	Robb
Burdick	Inouye	Rockefeller
Burns	Jeffords	Roth
Byrd	Johnston	Rudman
Chafee	Kassebaum	Sanford
Coats	Kasten	Sarbanes
Cochran	Kennedy	Sasser
Cohen	Kerry	Seymour
Conrad	Kohl	Shelby
Cranston	Lautenberg	Simon
D'Amato	Leahy	Simpson
Danforth	Levin	Specter
Daschle	Lieberman	Stevens
DeConcini	Lott	Thurmond
Dixon	Lugar	Warner
Dodd	Mack	Wellstone
Dole	McCain	Wirth
Domenici	McConnell	Wofford
Durenberger	Metzenbaum	

NAYS—6

Craig	Helms	Symms
Garn	Smith	Wallop

NOT VOTING—2

Harkin	Kerrey

So the bill (S. 2), as amended, was passed as follows:

S. 2

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE AND TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the "Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act".

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title and table of contents.
Sec. 2. Findings and purposes.

TITLE I—NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

PART A—NATIONAL GOALS

Sec. 101. Purpose.
Sec. 102. School readiness.
Sec. 103. School completion.
Sec. 104. Student achievement.
Sec. 105. Mathematics and science.
Sec. 106. Family literacy and lifelong learning.
Sec. 107. Safe, disciplined, and drug-free schools.

PART B—NATIONAL ACADEMIC REPORT CARD

Sec. 111. Short title.
Sec. 112. Findings and purpose.
Sec. 113. National Education Goals panel.
Sec. 114. Functions.
Sec. 115. Annual report card.
Sec. 116. Powers of the Panel.
Sec. 117. Administrative provisions.
Sec. 118. Director and staff; experts and consultants.
Sec. 119. Authorization of appropriations.

PART C—NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS COUNCIL

Sec. 131. National Education Standards and Assessments Council.
Sec. 132. Annual reports.
Sec. 133. Powers of the Council.
Sec. 134. Administrative provisions.
Sec. 135. Director and staff; experts and consultants.
Sec. 136. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE II—NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Sec. 201. Purpose.
Sec. 202. Allotment of funds.
Sec. 203. State application.
Sec. 204. Neighborhood Schools Improvement Advisory Council.
Sec. 205. State Neighborhood Schools Improvement Plan and report on restrictions.
Sec. 206. Review of State plans.
Sec. 207. State administration and local applications.
Sec. 208. Use of funds.
Sec. 209. Requirements relating to use of allotments.
Sec. 210. Evaluation requirements.
Sec. 211. Dissemination of exemplary practices by the Secretary.
Sec. 212. Authorization of appropriations.

TITLE III—EDUCATIONAL REFORM AND FLEXIBILITY

Sec. 301. Statement of findings and purpose.
Sec. 302. Flexibility and accountability in education and related services.

TITLE IV—DISTANCE LEARNING

Sec. 401. Distance learning study.
Sec. 402. Distance learning policy study.
Sec. 403. Definition.

TITLE V—PEACE CORPS

Sec. 501. Findings.
Sec. 502. Sense of the Senate.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

Sec. 601. Improved statistics regarding American schools.
Sec. 602. Freedom of speech on campus.
Sec. 603. Technical amendment.
Sec. 604. General Accounting Office report on the effect of tax incentives on local public school finance.

TITLE VII—DEFINITIONS

Sec. 701. Definitions.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) to achieve the National Education Goals each State must develop and implement widely shared, comprehensive strategies to support the revitalization of all public elementary and secondary schools;

(2) education improvement will require statewide reform strategies and an unshakable long-term commitment by State policymakers;

(3) educational improvement will require adequate commitment and investment from the Federal Government;

(4) educational reform will require that teachers and school leaders play the central role in designing and implementing changes at the school level and they must have access to high-quality training and professional development to maximize that role and increase their effectiveness;

(5) ultimately, meaningful educational reform will be achieved on a school by school basis;

(6) innovative and successful reform initiatives which are underway in schools throughout the Nation are not being replicated in sufficient number by schools where identical practices would further the National Education Goals;

(7) teachers, principals, parents and members of the local community can, in collaboration with the local educational agency, design effective education reform strategies to achieve the National Education Goals and be strongly committed to such plans if these individuals have access to the resources to implement such plans;

(8) schools receiving resources under this Act to implement a reform plan should be required to show improved academic achievement and progress towards the achievement of the National Education Goals;

(9) the Federal Government can best encourage efforts to achieve the National Education Goals by making resources available to States for the development of coherent and coordinated education reform plans and to assist neighborhood public schools in implementing education reform efforts; and

(10) the Federal Government can also encourage reform by establishing an independent, non-partisan mechanism to measure progress toward the achievement of the National Education Goals.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this Act to provide resources to assist States and neighborhood public schools in the design and implementation of education reform strategies to improve student achievement and achieve the National Education Goals.

TITLE I—NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS

PART A—NATIONAL GOALS

SEC. 101. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this title to establish a plan of action for the initial steps that the Federal Government must take in order to assist teachers, school leaders, parents, State and local governments, and businesses in the joint effort of achieving the National Education Goals as outlined in this title.

SEC. 102. SCHOOL READINESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that the Federal Government should expand its commitment to school readiness to ensure that all children are ready and able to begin school.

(b) POLICY.—It is the goal of the United States that, by the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn. As part of the joint effort of Federal, State, and local governments, organizations, institutions and individuals in achieving this goal, the Federal Government will take steps—

(1) to provide Head Start services to every eligible child who needs such services;

(2) to provide sufficient funding for the special supplemental food program for women, infants, and children so that all potentially eligible women, infants, and children have access to the services provided by the program;

(3) to assure that all women have access to affordable, high quality prenatal care and that all infants and children have access to affordable, high quality comprehensive and preventive health care, by providing sufficient funding for programs, including the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant, the Community and Migrant Health Center Grant Program, Medicaid, and the Childhood Immunization Grant Program;

(4) to expand funding for Even Start and the Follow Through Act to allow programs to reach all parts of the United States and to allow each State to fund a sufficient number of programs throughout the State so that approaches are available for local educational agencies, the State educational agency, and other organizations to adopt and implement;

(5) to provide sufficient funding to assist States in providing a free appropriate public education to preschool children with disabilities and early intervention services to infants and toddlers with disabilities and their

families pursuant to the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act; and

(6) to assure that every child participating in early childhood education is taught by a well-qualified teacher.

SEC. 103. SCHOOL COMPLETION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that in order for the Nation to improve its economic competitiveness, each individual in the United States must be educated to his or her greatest potential and must be encouraged to finish secondary school.

(b) POLICY.—It is the goal of the United States that, by the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent. As part of the joint effort of Federal, State, and local governments, organizations, institutions and individuals in achieving this goal, the Federal Government will take consistent steps—

(1) to expand funding for secondary school dropout prevention and reentry programs and basic skills programs to allow programs to reach all parts of the United States and to allow each State to fund a sufficient number of programs throughout the State so that approaches are available for local educational agencies, the State educational agency, and other organizations to adopt and implement; and

(2) to collect uniform, reliable data from the States with respect to school completion rates.

SEC. 104. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that American students are falling behind students in other industrialized nations on tests measuring abilities in all academic subject areas.

(b) POLICY.—It is the goal of the United States that, by the year 2000, American students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, history, and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, productive employment, and independent living in our modern economy. As part of the joint effort of Federal, State, and local governments, organizations, institutions and individuals in achieving this goal, the Federal Government will take steps—

(1) to provide appropriate educational assistance for all disadvantaged children in the United States by increasing the participation of eligible children in programs under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(2) to fulfill the commitment made by the United States in 1975 to provide 40 percent of the costs of educating children with disabilities;

(3) to reward successful programs in schools with concentrations of disadvantaged children;

(4) to promote efforts that encourage all students to be involved in activities that promote and demonstrate good citizenship, community service, and personal responsibility; and

(5) to encourage highly qualified individuals to become teachers and to remain in the teaching profession.

SEC. 105. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) most students in the United States are behind students from other industrialized nations on tests measuring achievement in mathematics and science;

(2) the Federal Government has a significant role in promoting the study of mathematics and science in elementary and secondary schools by providing financial assistance to local educational agencies to improve the general quality of programs for the study of mathematics and science through authorized mathematics and science education programs; and

(3) the Federal Government has indirectly assisted in the postsecondary study of mathematics and science by providing future scientists, mathematicians, and engineers with financial assistance to attend postsecondary institutions, but more incentives are needed to attract high-achieving students into these areas of study.

(b) POLICY.—It is the goal of the United States that, by the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement. As part of the joint effort of Federal, State, and local governments, organizations, institutions and individuals in achieving this goal, the Federal Government will take steps—

(1) to expand funding for the Excellence in Mathematics, Science, and Engineering Act of 1990 to increase the number of individuals, particularly women and minorities, in graduate and undergraduate programs in mathematics, science, and engineering;

(2) to expand funding for the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act so that all elementary teachers and all secondary teachers of mathematics and science will have an opportunity for updating and improving their mathematics and science education skills;

(3) to expand funding for such Act so that all elementary school teachers have an opportunity for skill improvement;

(4) to award scholarships to high-achieving students to pursue the study of mathematics, science, and related subjects at postsecondary institutions; and

(5) to encourage highly qualified individuals to become and to remain mathematics and science teachers in elementary and secondary schools.

SEC. 106. FAMILY LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARNING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) nearly 30,000,000 adults in the United States are lacking literacy skills which limits their ability to read, write, or speak in English or to compute or solve problems effectively; and

(2) the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist State and local governments in providing literacy services to those individuals in need of such services so that they may be full participants in society.

(b) POLICY.—It is the goal of the United States that, by the year 2000, every American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. As part of the joint effort of Federal, State, and local governments, organizations, institutions and individuals in achieving this goal, the Federal Government will take steps—

(1) to provide increased funding for the Adult Education Act so that all eligible individuals who seek such services under such Act will receive such services;

(2) to expand Federal assistance for literacy programs in order to assist State and local governments, public libraries, organizations and volunteers in providing all individuals lacking literacy skills the opportunity to acquire skills needed to function in society; and

(3) to provide increased funding for the rehabilitation and training of young persons with disabilities in accordance with the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

SEC. 107. SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) use of illicit drugs and alcohol continues to be a major problem that threatens the safety of the children of the Nation and impedes their ability to succeed in school and in their lives; and

(2) more Federal efforts are urgently needed in the areas of drug and alcohol abuse education and prevention.

(b) POLICY.—It is the goal of the United States that, by the year 2000, every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer a disciplined environment conductive to learning. As part of the joint effort of Federal, State, and local governments, organizations, institutions and individuals in achieving this goal, the Federal Government will take steps to ensure that all students receive drug abuse prevention education and counseling services.

PART B—NATIONAL ACADEMIC REPORT CARD

SEC. 111. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the "National Academic Report Card Act of 1991".

SEC. 112. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) the social well-being, economic stability, and national security of the United States depend on a strong educational system that provides all citizens with the skills necessary to become active members of a productive work force;

(2) despite the many reforms of the educational system that have been implemented since the National Council on Excellence in Education declared our Nation "at risk" in 1983, the United States remains at risk for educational underachievement;

(3) United States students currently rank far below students of many other countries in educational achievement, particularly in mathematics and the sciences;

(4) although State and local governments bear the primary responsibility for elementary and secondary education, rapidly increasing international competitiveness requires that the United States increase efforts to make education a national priority;

(5) the Federal Government has played a vital, leading role in funding important educational programs and research activities and should continue to play that role;

(6) accurate and reliable mechanisms must be available to assess and monitor educational progress;

(7) the mechanisms to assess and monitor educational progress, and the national information infrastructure needed to support the mechanisms, do not exist or must be strengthened;

(8) there should be established an independent, bipartisan panel, building on existing efforts to measure progress toward achievement of the National Education Goals;

(9) the Nation should also move forward to set national education standards and develop a voluntary system of assessments to help students and schools meet those standards;

(10) the primary purpose of developing standards and a system of assessments related to those standards is to inform instruction and improve learning;

(11) establishing voluntary national standards and assessments is an important, complex, and sensitive task and any coordinating structure for this purpose must be bipartisan, engage government at all levels, and involve the many constituencies that have an established interest in improving education;

(12) much work in the area of developing standards and assessments linked to those

standards has already begun and the national effort should benefit from and not attempt to duplicate any good work being done by existing Federal and non-Federal entities;

(13) in accordance with the recommendations of the National Council on Education Standards and Testing, a coordinating structure needs to be put into place to ensure that this work is being done;

(14) this coordinating structure should maintain the Nation's tradition of State and local authority over education and therefore be a part of a cooperative national effort; and

(15) there should be established a national coordinating body to ensure the establishment of national education standards and a voluntary system of assessments.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this part to establish the National Education Goals Panel, to establish the National Education Standards and Assessments Council, to provide resources to develop means to measure and report on progress toward the achievement of the National Education Goals, and to advance the establishment of world class education standards and the development of a voluntary system of assessments as a catalyst for comprehensive educational reforms.

SEC. 113. NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department of Education a National Education Goals Panel (hereafter in this part referred to as the "Panel").

(b) COMPOSITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Panel shall be composed of 14 members (hereafter in this part referred to as "members"), including—

(A) two members appointed by the President;

(B) eight Governors, three of whom shall be from the same political party as the President and five of whom shall be of the opposite political party of the President, appointed by the Chairman or Vice Chairman of the National Governors' Association, with each appointing those of his respective political party, in consultation with each other and in accordance with paragraph (2); and

(C) four Members of Congress appointed as follows:

(i) The Majority Leader of the Senate shall appoint 1 individual from among the Members of the Senate.

(ii) The Minority Leader of the Senate shall appoint 1 individual from among the Members of the Senate.

(iii) The Majority Leader of the House of Representatives shall appoint 1 individual from among the Members of the House of Representatives.

(iv) The Minority Leader of the House of Representatives shall appoint 1 individual from among the Members of the House of Representatives.

(2) SPECIAL APPOINTMENT RULES.—(A) The members appointed pursuant to paragraph (1)(B) shall be appointed as follows:

(i) If the Chairperson of the National Governors' Association is from the same political party as the President, then the Chairperson shall appoint 3 persons pursuant to such paragraph and the Vice Chairperson shall appoint 5 persons pursuant to such paragraph.

(ii) If the Chairperson of the National Governors' Association is from the opposite political party as the President, then the Chairperson shall appoint 5 persons pursuant to such paragraph and the Vice Chairperson shall appoint 3 persons pursuant to such paragraph.

(B) If the National Governors' Association has appointed a panel that meets the requirements of this subsection prior to the date of enactment of this Act, then the members serving on such panel shall be deemed to be in compliance with the provisions of this subsection and shall not be required to be reappointed pursuant to this subsection.

(c) TERMS.—The terms of service of members shall be as follows:

(1) EXECUTIVE BRANCH.—Members appointed under paragraph (1)(A) shall serve at the pleasure of the President.

(2) GOVERNORS.—Members appointed under paragraph (1)(B) shall serve a two-year term, except that the initial appointments under such paragraph shall be made to ensure staggered terms with one-half of the such member's terms concluding every two years.

(3) MEMBERS OF CONGRESS.—Members appointed under paragraph (1)(C) shall serve a term of four years.

(d) INITIATION.—The Panel may begin to carry out the duties of the Panel under this part when seven members of the Panel have been appointed.

(e) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The initial members shall be appointed not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(f) RETENTION.—In order to retain an appointment to the Panel, a member must attend at least two-thirds of the scheduled meetings of the Panel in any given year.

(g) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Panel shall not affect the powers of the Panel, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(h) TRAVEL.—Each member shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for each day the member is engaged in the performance of duties away from the home or regular place of business of the member.

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the panel $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993 and 1994, and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter.

(j) CHAIRPERSON SELECTION.—

(1) INITIAL SELECTION.—The members appointed under subsection (b)(2) shall select a Chairperson from among such members, except that after the expiration of the term of the member selected under this paragraph to serve as Chairperson as of October 1, 1991, or upon the termination of the tenure of such Chairperson, whichever is earlier, a majority of the members of the Council shall select the Chairperson from among the members.

(2) CONTINGENT SELECTION.—If no individual described in paragraph (1) assumes the position of Chairperson of the Council within 60 days of the date of the enactment of this Act, a majority of the members shall thereafter select a Chairperson from among the members.

SEC. 114. FUNCTIONS.

(a) FUNCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Panel shall—

(A) propose the indicators to be used to measure the National Education Goals and reporting progress toward their achievement, the baselines and benchmarks against which progress may be evaluated, and the format for an annual report to the Nation;

(B) select interim and final measures and appropriate measurement tools to be developed as necessary in each goal area;

(C) report on the Federal actions to fulfill its responsibilities to education, including funding the Federal financial role, providing more flexibility and controlling mandates that limit the States' ability to fund education;

(D) issue a report to the President, the Congress, the Governors, and the Nation annually on progress toward the National Education Goals;

(E) assure, through requirements for State reports, that student performance is reported in the context of other relevant information about student, school and system performance;

(F) identify gaps in existing educational data, make recommendations for improvements in the methods and procedures for assessments that would be appropriate to assessing progress toward the National Education Goals, propose changes in national and international measurement systems as appropriate and make recommendations to the President, the Congress, and the Governors for needed improvements;

(G) appoint members to the National Education Standards and Assessments Council; and

(H) in accordance with paragraph (2), issue certification of content and student performance standards and the criteria for assessments as world-class following submission of such certification by the National Education Standards and Assessments Council.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—In the event the Panel denies certification to all or part of a certification of the National Education Standards and Assessments Council, all or part of a certification shall be returned to such Council with detailed written explanations for the denial.

(b) PERFORMANCE OF FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out its responsibilities, the Panel shall operate on the principle of consensus.

(c) DATA COLLECTION.—The Panel shall make arrangements with any appropriate entity to generate or collect such data as may be necessary to appropriately assess progress toward the National Education Goals.

SEC. 115. ANNUAL REPORT CARD.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Panel shall prepare and submit to the President, the appropriate committees of Congress, and the Governor of each State a National Report Card, that—

(1) sets forth an analysis of the progress of the United States toward achieving the National Education Goals; and

(2) may, as determined necessary by the Panel based on the findings of the Panel and an analysis of the views and comments of all interested parties—

(A) identify continuing gaps in existing educational data; and

(B) make recommendations for improvement in the methods and procedures of assessing educational attainment and strengthening the national educational assessment and information system of the Department of Education or any other appropriate Federal Government entity.

(b) CONTINUATION.—Based on the timetable established in section 114, the Panel shall continue to issue a National Report Card on an annual basis for the duration of the existence of the Panel.

(c) FORMAT.—National Report Cards shall be presented in a form that is understandable to parents and the general public.

SEC. 116. POWERS OF THE PANEL.

(a) HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Panel shall, for the purpose of carrying out this part, conduct such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Panel considers appropriate.

(2) CONDUCT.—In carrying out this part, the Panel shall conduct public hearings in different geographic areas of the country, both urban and rural, to receive the reports,

views, and analyses of a broad spectrum of experts and the public regarding the Panel's functions described in section 114(a).

(b) INFORMATION.—The Panel may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable the Panel to carry out this title. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Panel, the head of a department or agency shall furnish such information to the Panel to the extent permitted by law.

(c) GIFTS.—The Panel may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(d) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Panel may use the United States mail in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—The Secretary of Education shall provide to the Panel, on a reimbursable basis, administrative support services as the Panel may request.

SEC. 117. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) MEETINGS.—The Panel shall meet on a regular basis, as necessary, at the call of the Chairperson of the Panel or a majority of its members.

(b) QUORUM.—A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(c) VOTING.—No individual may vote or exercise any of the powers of a member by proxy.

SEC. 118. DIRECTOR AND STAFF; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) DIRECTOR.—The Chairperson of the Panel shall, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the appointment and compensation of officers or employees of the United States, appoint a Director to be paid at a rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule.

(b) APPOINTMENT AND PAY OF STAFF.—The Chairperson of the Panel may appoint personnel as the Chairperson considers appropriate without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments to the competitive service. The staff of the Panel may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The rate of pay of the staff of the Panel shall not exceed the rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Panel may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3019(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon the request of the Panel, the head of any department or agency of the United States is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of that agency to the Panel to assist the Panel in its duties under this title.

SEC. 119. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 2001 to carry out this part.

PART C—NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS COUNCIL

SEC. 131. NATIONAL EDUCATION STANDARDS AND ASSESSMENTS COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department of Education a National Education Standards and Assessments Council (referred to in this part as the "Council").

(b) APPOINTMENT AND COMPOSITION.—

(1) APPOINTMENT.—The Council shall be composed of 21 members (hereafter in this part referred to as "members") appointed by the National Education Goals Panel described in section 113 (hereafter in this part referred to as the "Panel").

(2) COMPOSITION.—The Council shall be composed of—

(A) seven public officials;

(B) seven educators; and

(C) seven members of the general public.

(3) TIME.—The members of the Council described in paragraph (2) shall be appointed within 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(c) QUALIFICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Members shall be appointed to the Council on the basis of widely recognized experience in, knowledge of, commitment to, and a demonstrated record of service to education and to achieving education excellence at the Federal, State or local level.

(2) NOMINATIONS.—Members under this subsection shall be appointed from among qualified individuals nominated by the public.

(d) TERMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The members shall be appointed for three-year terms, with no member serving more than 2 consecutive terms.

(2) INITIAL SELECTION.—The Panel shall establish initial terms for individuals of two, three, or four years in order to establish a rotation in which one-third of the members are selected each year.

(A) PUBLIC OFFICIALS.—From among the members appointed under subsection (b)(2)(A), the Panel shall designate 2 appointees to serve 2-year terms, 3 appointees to serve 3-year terms and 2 appointees to serve 4-year terms.

(B) EDUCATORS.—From among the members appointed under subsection (b)(2)(B), the Panel shall designate 2 appointees to serve 2-year terms, 3 appointees to serve 3-year terms and 2 appointees to serve 4-year terms.

(C) GENERAL PUBLIC.—From among the members appointed under subsection (b)(2)(C), the Panel shall designate 2 appointees to serve 2-year terms, 3 appointees to serve 3-year terms and 2 appointees to serve 4-year terms.

(3) SPECIAL PROVISION.—No member of the Panel may concurrently serve as a member of the Council.

(4) DATE OF APPOINTMENT.—The initial members shall be appointed, by the Panel, not later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) RETENTION.—In order to retain an appointment to the Council, a member must attend at least two-thirds of the scheduled meetings of the Council in any given year.

(6) OFFICER SELECTION.—The members appointed under subsection (b)(2) shall select officers of the Council from among the members of the Council. The officers of the Council shall serve for 1-year terms.

(7) VACANCIES.—A vacancy on the Council shall not affect the powers of the Council, but shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(8) TRAVEL.—Each member of the Council shall be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5703 of title 5, United States Code, for each day the member is engaged in the performance of duties away from the home or regular place of business of the member.

(9) INITIATION.—The Council may begin to carry out the duties of the Council under this part when—

(A) all 21 members have been appointed; or

(B) 11 members have been appointed pursuant to the provisions of subsection (b).

(e) FUNCTIONS OF THE COUNCIL.—The Council shall—

(1) be a coordinating body to ensure the establishment of national education standards;

(2) serve as a coordinating body to encourage a voluntary system of assessments for individual students consistent with the national standards;

(3) develop criteria for world-class content and student performance standards and establish guidelines for standard setting and assessment development;

(4) establish guidelines for assessments which ensure technical merit through determining that assessments are specifically valid, reliable, fair and cost effective for any purpose for which the assessments may be used;

(5) establish procedures and criteria for ensuring that, to the extent possible and without sacrificing the validity, reliability, directness, and fairness of the assessments, assessments are comparable to each other; and

(6) issue certification of content and student performance standards and criteria for assessments as world-class, and transmit such certification to the Panel for the Panel's certification.

(f) PERFORMANCE OF FUNCTIONS.—In carrying out its responsibilities, the Council shall work with Federal and non-Federal agencies and organizations which are conducting research, studies or demonstration projects to determine world-class education standards and assessments based on such standards.

(g) DATA COLLECTION.—The Council shall make arrangements with any appropriate entity to generate or collect such data as may be necessary to carry out its functions.

SEC. 132. ANNUAL REPORTS.

Not later than 1 year after the date the Council concludes its first meeting of members and in each succeeding year, the Council shall prepare and submit to the President, the appropriate committees of Congress, and the Governor of each State a report on its work.

SEC. 133. POWERS OF THE COUNCIL.

(a) HEARINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Council shall, for the purpose of carrying out this part, conduct such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, and receive such evidence, as the Council considers appropriate.

(2) CONDUCT.—In carrying out this part, the Council shall conduct public hearings in different geographic areas of the country, both urban and rural, to receive the reports, views, and analyses of a broad spectrum of experts and the public on the establishment of national education standards and assessments.

(b) INFORMATION.—The Council may secure directly from any department or agency of the United States information necessary to enable the Council to carry out this part. Upon request of the Chairperson of the Council, the head of a department or agency shall furnish such information to the Council to the extent permitted by law.

(c) GIFTS.—The Council may accept, use, and dispose of gifts or donations of services or property.

(d) POSTAL SERVICES.—The Council may use the United States mail in the same manner and under the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States.

(e) ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPORTIVE SERVICES.—The Secretary shall provide to the Council, on a reimbursable basis, adminis-

trative support services as the Council may request.

SEC. 134. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) MEETINGS.—The Council shall meet on a regular basis, as necessary, at the call of the Chairperson of the Council or a majority of its members.

(b) QUORUM.—A majority of the members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business.

(c) VOTING.—The Council shall take all action of the Council by a 2/3 majority vote of the total membership of the Council, assuring the right of the minority to issue written views. No individual may vote or exercise any of the powers of a member by proxy.

SEC. 135. DIRECTOR AND STAFF; EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.

(a) DIRECTOR.—The Chairperson of the Council shall, without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, relating to the appointment and compensation of officers or employees of the United States, appoint a Director to be paid at a rate not to exceed the rate of basic pay payable for level V of the Executive Schedule.

(b) APPOINTMENT AND PAY OF STAFF.—The Chairperson may appoint personnel as the Chairperson considers appropriate without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments to the competitive service. The staff of the Council may be paid without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates. The rate of pay of the staff of the Council shall not exceed the rate of basic pay payable for GS-15 of the General Schedule.

(c) EXPERTS AND CONSULTANTS.—The Council may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3019(b) of title 5, United States Code.

(d) STAFF OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.—Upon the request of the Council, the head of any department or agency of the United States is authorized to detail, on a reimbursable basis, any of the personnel of that department or agency to the Council to assist the Council in its duties under this title.

SEC. 136. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Council $2,000,000 for each of the fiscal years 1992, 1993 and 1994 and such sums as may be necessary for each succeeding fiscal year thereafter.

TITLE II—NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT ACT

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

It is the purpose of this title to provide multiyear financial assistance to public elementary and secondary schools to encourage all schools to engage in comprehensive improvement to—

(1) meet the National Education Goals;

(2) improve the educational achievement of the students attending the school; and

(3) increase community, parental and business collaboration to improve such schools and raise academic achievement.

SEC. 202. ALLOTMENT OF FUNDS.

(a) RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall reserve 1 percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authority of section 212 in each fiscal year to award grants to the Pacific outlying area and to the Secretary of the Interior for the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools using whatever mechanism the Secretary determines shall best meet the purposes of this title.

(b) ALLOTMENT.—From the amount appropriated pursuant to the authority of section 212 in each fiscal year and not reserved pursuant to subsection (a), the Secretary shall allot to each State educational agency having an application approved under section 203 an amount which bears the same relation to—

(1) 50 percent of such funds as the amount such State educational agency received under chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the preceding fiscal year bears to the amount received by all State educational agencies under such chapter in such fiscal year; and

(2) 50 percent of such funds as the amount such State educational agency received under chapter 2 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the preceding fiscal year bears to the amount received by all State educational agencies under such chapter in such fiscal year.

(c) STATE MINIMUM.—No State educational agency, by reason of the application of subsection (b) shall receive an allotment under this title in any fiscal year which is less than one-quarter of one percent of the amount appropriated pursuant to the authority of section 212 for such fiscal year.

(d) GENERAL USE OF ALLOTMENT.—

(1) INITIAL YEAR.—In the initial year for which a State educational agency receives an allotment under this title, funds under such allotment shall be used to develop a State Neighborhood Schools Improvement Plan as required under section 205.

(2) SPECIAL RULE.—A State educational agency may, in the first year for which funds are received under this title, use funds not otherwise used for planning activities as described in section 205, for training and professional development activities for teachers and school leaders and for initiatives to increase parental choice among public schools. Any such funds remaining at the end of such year may be carried over by the State educational agency for distribution to schools in the following year.

(3) SECOND AND SUCCEEDING YEARS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of section 209, in the second and succeeding years for which a State educational agency receives an allotment under this title, not to exceed 10 percent of the funds received under such allotment in each such year may be used for evaluations, administrative activities, and technical assistance to assist local schools in preparing an application to be submitted pursuant to section 207(c) and for the review of local applications. The remainder of such funds shall be made available to local schools as required in section 208.

(B) WAIVER.—A chief State school officer, in consultation with the Governor, may submit an application to the Secretary for a waiver of the requirements of subparagraph (A). Under such waiver, the Secretary may permit such State to expend not to exceed an additional 10 percent of the funds received under this title for activities such as—

(i) teacher training and professional development for teachers and school leaders;

(ii) initiatives to increase parental choice among public schools, including assessment of student needs and parent information and referral programs, if such initiatives permit parents of students served by a school to choose a school in accordance with this clause and encourage parents to participate in governance, management processes, or activities related to their children's education programs;

(iii) the establishment of new public schools, such as Essential Schools, Accelerated Schools, New American Schools, charter schools, ComerSchools, and Schools of the 21st Century in accordance with subparagraph (C);

(iv) providing grants to business and education partnerships to enable such partnerships to plan, establish and operate model secondary schools or programs for science and mathematics or technology education, including such schools or programs which place a priority on serving disadvantaged or female secondary school students; and

(v) other activities developed in conjunction with local education agencies that are designed to improve student achievement in the public schools.

(C) ADDITIONAL WAIVER AUTHORITY FOR NEW AMERICAN SCHOOLS.—A chief State school officer, in consultation with the Governor, may submit an application to the Secretary for an additional waiver of the requirements of subparagraph (A). Under such waiver, the Secretary may permit such State educational agency to expend not to exceed an additional 15 percent of the funds received under this title for the establishment of New American Schools in accordance with subparagraph (D).

(D) SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS.—An application for a waiver under subparagraph (C), shall—

(i) include procedures for the consideration of applications for schools which have—

(I) adopted the National Education Goals;

(II) established and implemented a community-wide strategy for achieving those goals;

(III) developed a "report-card" for measuring and reporting to the public, at least once each year, the progress toward achievement of the goals; and

(IV) demonstrated a willingness and commitment to make substantial improvements in the education of children in the community; and

(ii) give priority in awarding grants to eligible recipients serving communities with high concentrations of educationally disadvantaged children and children from low-income families.

(E) SPECIAL RULE.—Any new public school established under this title shall be nonsectarian in its programs, admissions policies, employment practices, and all other operations and shall not be affiliated with a nonpublic sectarian school or religious institution.

(F) SPECIAL REQUIREMENT.—A new public school established under subparagraph (B)(iii) shall be nonsectarian in its programs, admission policies, employment practices, and all other operations and shall not be affiliated with a nonpublic sectarian school or a religious institution.

SEC. 203. STATE APPLICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—A State educational agency desiring to receive an allotment under this title shall prepare and submit to the Secretary an application at such time, in such manner and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

(b) FIRST YEAR.—In the first year an application is submitted under this section such application shall contain a description of, the process and procedures that the State educational agency will undertake to establish, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Advisory Council in accordance with section 204.

(c) SECOND YEAR.—In the second year an application is submitted under this section such application shall include the State Neighborhood Schools Improvement Plan described in section 205.

SEC. 204. NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT ADVISORY COUNCIL.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency receiving an allotment under this

title shall establish a Neighborhood Schools Improvement Advisory Council (hereafter referred to in this title as the "Council").

(2) FUNCTIONS.—The Council shall serve as an advisory group for the development of a comprehensive and systemic plan to improve the public elementary and secondary schools in the State, to review the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Plan developed by the State educational agency, and to advise on the development of the criteria used to evaluate applications for Neighborhood Schools Improvement Grants.

(b) COMPOSITION AND REPRESENTATION.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—(A) The Council shall be composed of 14 members, of which—

(i) seven shall be appointed by the State educational agency; and

(ii) seven shall be appointed by the Governor.

(B) The State educational agency and the Governor shall appoint members of the Council pursuant to this section so that such members are in approximate proportion to the relative distribution of students in the State who are from urban and rural areas in the State. The Council shall include, at a minimum, representatives of the State educational agency, the Governor, State legislators, local educational agencies, the business community, parents, public school teachers, and public school administrators.

(2) REPRESENTATION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A Council established pursuant to this section shall be broadly and widely representative of the population of the State.

(B) HIGH NEED SCHOOLS.—Not less than 50 percent of the members of the Council appointed by the State educational agency and the Governor shall be selected from communities with schools designated as high need schools in accordance with section 207(a)(2) and shall include public school teachers, school leaders and parents.

(c) CHAIRPERSON.—The Council shall appoint a chairperson.

SEC. 205. STATE NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS IMPROVEMENT PLAN AND REPORT ON RESTRICTIONS.

(a) PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The State educational agency shall, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and in consultation with the Council, develop a State Neighborhood Schools Improvement Plan, that meets the requirements of subsection (b), for the improvement of academic achievement in all public elementary and secondary schools in the State and to assist the State in achieving the National Education Goals.

(2) REVIEW AND COMMENT; TRANSMISSION.—The plan described in paragraph (1) shall be submitted to the Council and the Governor for review and comment. The Council and the Governor shall review the plan and submit their comments to the State educational agency within 30 days of receipt of such plan. Such comments shall be transmitted by the State educational agency along with the plan to the Secretary as part of the application described in section 203(b).

(b) GENERAL REQUIREMENTS OF PLANS.—A State Neighborhood Schools Improvement Plan developed under subsection (a) shall contain a plan for the comprehensive and systemic reform of all public schools in the State to assist such State in improving the academic achievement of all students and achieving the National Education Goals. Such plan shall—

(1) affirm the commitment of the State to the National Education Goals and describe the measures to be taken to achieve such goals;

(2) establish the goal of transforming the system of education to provide every child a high quality education;

(3) describe the manner in which appropriate resources will be provided to implement the reform plan;

(4) describe the manner in which the State will measure progress made towards achieving the National Education Goals and make such information available to the public;

(5) describe plans to improve the professional development of teachers and school leaders;

(6) provide an evaluation of the efforts undertaken to achieve the goals;

(7) contain a description of the manner in which the State educational agency shall encourage and enhance improvement in all public schools in the State to improve student achievement to meet the National Education Goals;

(8) affirm the importance of identifying and incorporating into reform plans successful ongoing efforts which further the State strategy to achieve the National Education Goals; and

(9) describe the measures to be taken to assure widespread public support for the plan.

(c) DESCRIPTION OF GRANT ADMINISTRATION.—A State Neighborhood Schools Improvement Plan developed under subsection (a) shall describe the measures to be undertaken by the State to administer the allotment provided to the State under this title. In meeting the requirement of this subsection, such plan shall include—

(1) a description of the procedures that shall be used to—

(A) identify and inform local educational agencies and schools about the program assisted under this title; and

(B) provide technical assistance, where necessary or requested, to help local educational agencies and schools, especially high need schools, prepare the applications submitted pursuant to section 207(b);

(2) a description of the measures to be undertaken to monitor and evaluate the activities and results at schools receiving a grant under this title;

(3) a description of the measures to be undertaken to implement a competitive process to award grants under this title in accordance with section 207;

(4) an assurance that grants awarded under this title shall be equitably distributed among local educational agencies with the greatest number or concentration of economically disadvantaged students;

(5) an assurance that funds received under this title shall be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State and local funds available to the schools;

(6) an assurance that funding under this title shall terminate if the State educational agency determines that a school—

(A) is not successfully implementing the activities and services described in the application submitted pursuant to section 207(b); or

(B) is not making measurable gains in student achievement or increasing the graduation rate at such school in the fourth, fifth, and, if appropriate, succeeding years of the project assisted under this title;

(7) a description of an appeals process available for schools whose funding under this title has been terminated pursuant to paragraph (6), and an assurance that any such decision to terminate funding shall be reviewed;

(8) a description of the steps the State educational agency shall use to ensure that successful practices identified through grants awarded to schools under this title or ongoing in a school shall be disseminated to other schools served by the State educational agency and the measures to be taken by the State educational agency to encourage and assist other schools in implementing such successful practices; and

(9) an assurance that the State educational agency shall inform the Secretary of the most successful neighborhood schools served under this title, and provide such information regarding such schools as the Secretary shall request in order to facilitate the national dissemination of successful practices.

(d) IDENTIFICATION OF LAWS AND REGULATIONS THAT RESTRICT FLEXIBILITY.—At the end of the initial year, the Council shall prepare and submit to the Secretary, the Governor, the State educational agency and the State legislature a report identifying Federal and State statutes, rules and regulations that, in the opinion of the relevant local school teachers and administrators, restrict school level flexibility and make it difficult for the schools to improve academic achievement and reach the National Education Goals.

(e) SPECIAL RULE FOR STATES WHICH ALREADY HAVE ENACTED A COMPREHENSIVE, STATEWIDE EDUCATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN.—

(1) WAIVER.—In the case of a State which has enacted a comprehensive, statewide education improvement plan, the Secretary may, in accordance with the provisions of section 206, grant such State a waiver from the requirements of section 204 and subsections (a) and (b) of section 205, and such State may use an allotment under this section in the initial and succeeding years in accordance with the provisions of section 202(c)(3).

(2) APPLICATION.—Each State desiring a waiver under this subsection shall include a request for such waiver in application submitted under section 203. Such application shall include a plan which meets the requirements of section 205(c).

SEC. 206. REVIEW OF STATE PLANS.

The Secretary shall, through a peer review process, review plans submitted under section 205 to ensure that the plans meet the requirements of such section. A plan shall not be disapproved because such plan lacks one or more specific education reform strategies or initiatives. The Secretary shall specify, in writing, the reasons for disapproving any plan and shall submit such written reasons to the appropriate State educational agency.

SEC. 207. STATE ADMINISTRATION AND LOCAL APPLICATIONS.

(a) REQUIREMENT FOR GRANTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency receiving an allotment under this title shall award grants under this title to schools within the State that have submitted an application pursuant to subsection (b).

(2) HIGH NEED SCHOOLS.—For the purpose of this title the term "high need school" means a school designated by the State educational agency as meeting at least two of the following criteria:

(A) The school is eligible to participate in a schoolwide project assisted under section 1015 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(B) The school is located in a school district experiencing extreme financial distress (such as bankruptcy, State takeover or undergoing consolidation because of financial problems).

(C) The school is among the 25 percent of all elementary schools in the State with the

greatest number or concentration of children eligible to be counted under section 1005(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(D) The school is among the 25 percent of all secondary schools in the State with the greatest number or concentration of children eligible to be counted under section 1005(c) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(E) The school is among the 25 percent of all elementary schools in the State with the lowest levels of student achievement, as measured by the State, or, in the case of a State that has no statewide assessment system, as shown by the school through the use of a nationally normed test that demonstrates the school ranks in the lowest quartile of student achievement.

(F) The school is among the 25 percent of all secondary schools in the State with the lowest levels of student achievement, as measured by the State, or, in the case of a State that has no statewide assessment system, as shown by the school through the use of a nationally normed test that demonstrates the school ranks in the lowest quartile of student achievement.

(G) The school is participating in a school improvement program pursuant to section 1021(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

(b) LOCAL APPLICATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) PREPARATION.—Each school desiring a grant under this title shall prepare an application, in consultation with the appropriate local or intermediate educational agency, at such time, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the State educational agency may reasonably require, and shall submit such application to the local educational agency.

(B) DESIGNS.—In preparing an application under subparagraph (A), a school is encouraged to review and utilize, as appropriate, research, model projects and other activities conducted or sponsored by the New American Schools Development Corporation, federally funded educational research laboratories and centers, the Commission on National and Community Service, public and private nonprofit research organizations, the National Diffusion Network, and the Department of Education.

(C) REVIEW, COMMENT AND SUBMISSION.—(i) In submitting the application described in subparagraph (A) each local educational agency shall—

(I) review, comment and offer any recommendations regarding the application submitted by a school pursuant to subparagraph (A); and

(II) submit such application to the State educational agency within 30 days of receipt of such application.

(ii) In making the comments described in clause (i), the local educational agency shall—

(I) assure that funds received under this title shall supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local funds available to the school for the activities and services assisted under this title;

(II) provide data on the poverty level and the academic achievement of the students at the school;

(III) describe the resources and commitment that the local educational agency will contribute to a school assisted under this title to help the school meet the National Education Goals and improve the academic achievement of the students attending the school, including an assurance that the local educational agency shall expedite action on requests for assistance made by such school;

(IV) describe steps the local educational agency will take to encourage and enhance comprehensive improvement in other schools in the local educational agency in order to meet the National Education Goals;

(V) assure that the local educational agency shall act as the fiduciary agent for a school receiving a grant under this title and shall expeditiously transmit to the school any grant funds received from the State educational agency under this title, except as provided in paragraph (2);

(VI) describe the technical assistance and dissemination activities that the local educational agency shall undertake to assist schools receiving a grant under this title; and

(VII) provide assurances that—

(aa) the application was originated by the school seeking such a grant;

(bb) all funds received under this title, except as provided in paragraph (2), shall be spent for the benefit of the school at the direction of local school officials; and

(cc) the activities assisted under this title shall be directed at the school.

(iii) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, if a local educational agency is unable or unwilling to act as a fiduciary agent for a school receiving a grant under this title in accordance with subclause (V) of clause (ii), then the State educational agency, in making such a grant to such a school, shall make alternative arrangements so that the school may receive the funds.

(2) LIMITATION.—Each local educational agency receiving a grant under this title on behalf of a school may use not more than 5 percent of such grant funds for administration, technical assistance, dissemination and evaluation of activities assisted under this title.

(3) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted pursuant to this subsection shall describe—

(A) the school's academic goals and the status of students in such school with respect to such goals;

(B) a comprehensive, schoolwide initiative likely to result in the school making substantial progress toward the National Education Goals, especially such goals related to the improvement of student achievement;

(C) the goals for the initiative and a multiyear plan to improve student achievement at the school;

(D) the steps to be taken by the school to achieve the goals of the initiative;

(E) the staff development activities to be conducted in implementing the initiative;

(F) efforts, if any, to link the activities of the school with federally supported teacher training and school leadership activities;

(G) the use of funds to achieve such goals;

(H) the statistical indicators to be used to measure progress toward achieving the National Education Goals, especially such goals related to the improvement of student achievement;

(I) the schedule for reporting the data described in subparagraph (H) to the State and the local community at least once a year beginning at the conclusion of the second year in which a grant payment under this title is made and annually thereafter and an assurance that such data shall be reported in a manner that is clear, and easily understandable;

(J) how the local educational agency will use funds, if any, reserved for the local educational agency under paragraph (2); and

(K) how the local educational agency and the school will meet the special educational needs of limited-English proficient students and students with disabilities attending the school.

(4) ASSURANCES.—In preparing the application described in this subsection the school shall ensure that such application shall—

(A) be developed by school administrators, teachers, parents, and community-based organizations and local businesses, in consultation with the local educational agency; and

(B) give clear evidence that commitment to such project is widely shared in the school community.

(c) STATE REPORT.—Each State educational agency receiving an allotment under this title, after awarding grants under this title in each fiscal year, shall file a report with the Secretary indicating—

(1) the names and addresses of the schools that received a Neighborhood Schools Improvement Grant under this title;

(2) the improvement activities each school shall undertake and the expected results of such activities;

(3) the number of high need schools that have received a grant and the amount of such grants;

(4) the Council's reasons for the selection of each such school; and

(5) the amount of the grant awarded to each school.

SEC. 208. USE OF FUNDS.

(a) MANDATORY.—Each school receiving a grant under this title shall use such grant funds for an initiative to implement significant, comprehensive, schoolwide changes in the structure or programs of such school in a manner that shall help such school meet the National Education Goals, especially by improving student achievement.

(b) PERMISSIBLE.—Each school receiving a grant under this title may use such grant funds for—

(1) continuous and comprehensive early childhood education;

(2) enhanced academic programs, including supplementary instruction, efforts to improve higher order thinking skills, and activities to increase the participation of minority and female students in mathematics and science courses;

(3) school-based management programs designed to move more authority for decision-making to the school building level and increase the participation of teachers and parents in school governance;

(4) the provision of coordinated educational and vocational services within the school which may include comprehensive programs (developed with input from local, State and area business leaders) to provide options for those high school students unlikely to attend postsecondary school, that integrate essential academic instruction with technical skills, and provide the training necessary to succeed in a technical career;

(5) projects to increase the knowledge and skills of teachers and school leaders;

(6) educational enrichment projects to meet the needs of educationally and economically disadvantaged children, students with disabilities, and limited-English proficient students;

(7) projects to improve the condition and adequacy of school buildings, instructional facilities and equipment when such improvements are directly related to improving student achievement, except that no funds shall be used for construction or major remodeling;

(8) projects to strengthen parent involvement and parenting education and to increase the partnership between families and the schools;

(9) extended day and year projects, especially projects with an academic component;

(10) projects to increase the use of educational technology and integrate such technology into the instructional program of the school to improve student achievement;

(11) the implementation of measures to reduce class size and provide more individualized instruction;

(12) dropout prevention, re-entry, alternative programs and support activities for students at-risk of dropping out of school, or students who have returned to school;

(13) projects to educate students in alcohol and drug awareness and prevention;

(14) projects to educate students in gang awareness and gang violence prevention;

(15) service-learning and student community service projects; and

(16) any other initiative which will result in significant, comprehensive schoolwide changes in the structure or programs of such school.

SEC. 209. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO USE OF ALLOTMENTS.

(a) RESERVATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency receiving an allotment under this title shall reserve not less than 75 percent of such funds to award grants on a competitive basis to schools designated as high need schools in the State in accordance with section 207(a)(2).

(2) REMAINDER.—The remainder of funds not reserved pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be available to award grants on a competitive basis to any school that needs to improve student achievement, as determined by the State educational agency. In distributing funds under this paragraph, priority shall be given to schools with the lowest levels of academic achievement.

(b) SPECIAL RULES.—

(1) ADDITIONAL EFFORTS.—Each school receiving a grant under this title that requires additional efforts to implement the provisions of this title may use the first 6 months in which such grant is received for planning purposes if the State educational agency has approved such use.

(2) LIMITATION.—No school shall receive a grant under this title prior to January 1, 1993.

(c) DURATION.—Grants awarded under this title may be awarded for a period not to exceed 5 years and may be renewed if the State determines that the applicant has made meaningful progress in improving student achievement.

(d) AMOUNT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each State educational agency receiving an allotment under this title shall award grants in accordance with the provisions of this title and in an amount that reflects, relative to other grants awarded under this title and in light of the proposed project, the size and economic profile of the student population to be served.

(2) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Each State educational agency receiving an allotment under this title shall award a grant to a local educational agency for a school in an amount that is of sufficient size and scope to permit the school to conduct a significant comprehensive, schoolwide project.

SEC. 210. EVALUATION REQUIREMENTS.

(a) EVALUATION.—Each State educational agency receiving an allotment under this title shall evaluate the initiatives assisted under this title. Such evaluations shall be designed to ensure that such initiatives are being implemented satisfactorily and that schools receiving grants are making demonstrable progress in improving student achievement or increasing the graduation rate.

(b) DATA.—Each local educational agency serving a school that receives a grant under this title shall annually collect and submit to the State educational agency data on the project assisted under this title based on the statistical indicators and other criteria described in the application submitted by the school. Such data shall include multiple measures or indicators of each National Education Goal, as available, and may take into consideration the mobility of students in the schools served under this title or other special factors.

SEC. 211. DISSEMINATION OF EXEMPLARY PRACTICES BY THE SECRETARY.

Each State educational agency shall submit to the Secretary information about successful Neighborhood Schools under its jurisdiction. The Secretary shall make summaries of such information available to schools that are undertaking, or planning to undertake improvement projects, regardless of whether such projects are assisted under this title, by means of the dissemination mechanisms established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall biennially provide to the Congress summaries of all data collected from and reports filed by schools, local educational agencies and State educational agencies pursuant to the requirements of this title.

SEC. 212. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated $850,000,000 for fiscal year 1992 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 1993 through 2001 to carry out the provisions of this title, of which not more than $75,000,000 shall be available in any one fiscal year to carry out the provisions of section 202(c)(1).

TITLE III—EDUCATIONAL REFORM AND FLEXIBILITY

SEC. 301. STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) historically, Federal education programs have addressed the Nation's most pressing educational problems by providing categorical assistance with detailed requirements relating to the use of funds;

(2) while the approach described in paragraph (1) has proven generally successful, some program requirements may inadvertently impede educational achievement;

(3) the Nation's schools are being asked to deal effectively with increasingly diverse educational needs that current program structures may not be flexible enough to address; and

(4) in an era when educational change and reform must prevail, it is more important than ever to provide programs that—

(A) result in improved educational outcomes for all students;

(B) promote the coordination of education and related services that benefit children and their families;

(C) respond flexibly to the needs of a diverse student population;

(D) stop the proliferation of unnecessary Federal, State, and local regulation; and

(E) place less emphasis on measuring resources and reviewing procedures and more emphasis on achieving program results.

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this title to establish a national demonstration program which—

(1) promotes educational reform that leads to improved educational outcomes for participants in affected programs;

(2) holds accountable the schools and other recipients of Federal funds for achieving specific educational improvement goals in exchange for increased flexibility in the use of their resources; and

(3) enables school and program administrators, teachers, parents, local agencies, and community groups to work together to develop effective education programs that lead to improved achievement and meet the needs of all participants, particularly those who are disadvantaged.

SEC. 302. FLEXIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart 1 of Part C of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221 et seq.) is amended by adding after section 421A a new section 421B to read as follows:

"SEC. 421B. FLEXIBILITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY IN EDUCATION AND RELATED SERVICES.

"(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) The Secretary shall, in accordance with this section, assist elementary and secondary schools and other service providers to improve the achievement of all students and other participants, but particularly disadvantaged individuals, by authorizing waivers to not more than 6 States, which have implemented comprehensive regulatory reform plans, and no more than 50 local educational agencies in each State local educational agencies by which the States can improve the performance of schools and programs by increasing their flexibility in the use of their resources while holding them accountable for achieving educational gains.

"(B)(i) In support of these projects, the Secretary is authorized to waive any statutory or regulatory requirement (except as provided in subsection (e)) applicable to a program described in clause (ii) that the Secretary determines may impede the ability of a school or other service provider to meet the special needs of such students and other individuals in the most effective manner possible. The head of any other Federal agency in accordance with the programs described in clause (ii) is similarly authorized to waive such requirements applicable to an elementary, secondary, or youth vocational training program administered by such agency if the agency head and the Secretary agree that such a waiver would promote the purpose of this section.

"(ii) The Secretary shall only waive a statutory or regulatory requirement applicable to a program under—

"(I) chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

"(II) chapter 2 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

"(III) the Dwight D. Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education Act;

"(IV) the Follow Through Act;

"(V) subtitle B of title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; and

"(VI) the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Applied Technology Education Act, except part H of title III and funds allocated by States under section 232 of such Act.

"(2) PROJECT DURATION.—Projects conducted under this section, and any waivers associated with such projects, shall last no longer than three years, except that the Secretary may extend a project and any associated waivers for an additional 2 years if the Secretary determines that the project is making substantial progress in meeting its goals.

"(3) TERMINATION.—The Secretary shall terminate a project and its associated waivers if the Secretary, at any time, determines

it is not making acceptable progress toward meeting its goals. The head of any other Federal agency who has granted waivers under this section shall determine whether to extend or terminate those waivers, but the Secretary shall have exclusive authority to extend or terminate the project.

"(b) ELIGIBILITY.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Each project that involves elementary or secondary schools shall include the participation of a local educational agency and at least 2 schools.

"(2) GRADE AND PROGRAM REQUIREMENT.—To the extent possible, each grade and academic program in a participating school shall participate in the project.

"(c) APPLICATIONS.—A local educational agency, wishing to conduct a project under this section, shall submit an application to the State educational agency for approval. The State educational agency shall then transmit approved applications to the Secretary. Each application shall be submitted within 2 years of enactment of the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act and shall include a plan that—

"(1) describes the purposes and overall expected outcomes of the project;

"(2) identifies, for each school or site participating in the project, those impediments to improved educational outcomes that would be removed by the proposed waivers;

"(3) identifies the Federal programs to be included in the project, the Federal statutory or regulatory requirements to be waived, and the purpose and duration of the requested waivers;

"(4) describes the State and local requirements that will be waived, the purpose of such waivers, and, if such requirements will not have been waived before the project begins, when those waivers will be obtained and take effect;

"(5) demonstrates the State has made an effort to waive substantial requirements pertaining to the local educational agency;

"(6) describes specific, measurable, educational improvement goals for each school or other site in the project and for each school year of the project, including—

"(A) goals for improving the achievement of all participants, including disadvantaged individuals, with respect to achievement in basic and advanced skills;

"(B) goals that reflect the broad purposes of each program for which a waiver is sought; and

"(C) an explanation of how the applicant will measure progress in meeting the goals set for each school or site in the project and for disadvantaged individuals participating in the project;

"(7) incorporates the comments of the Governor or the chief State school officer; and

"(8) for projects involving elementary or secondary schools—

"(A) identifies the schools to be included in the project and describes the student population at each school, including—

"(i) current data regarding the achievement of the disadvantaged students as well as other students; and

"(ii) the number of students who—

"(I) are of limited English proficiency, as defined in section 7003(a)(1) of the Bilingual Education Act;

"(II) are children with disabilities, as defined in section 602(a)(1) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act;

"(III) are currently or formerly migratory;

"(IV) are educationally deprived, for the purposes of chapter 1 of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and

"(V) are eligible for a free or reduced price school lunch;

"(B) describes specific goals for enhancing coordination between the regular education program available to all students and programs serving disadvantaged students;

"(C) if fewer than all the schools in a local educational agency will participate in a project, describes the expected educational outcomes for disadvantaged students in schools that do not participate, and how those outcomes will be assessed;

"(D) describes how school administrators, teachers, staff, and parents (including parents of educationally disadvantaged children) have been, or will be, involved in the planning, development, and implementation of the goals and program for each participating school; and

"(E) contains goals for students targeted by the programs described in clause (ii) of section 421B(a)(1)(B) which are comparable to, or exceed existing goals under such programs.

"(d) APPROVAL OF PROJECTS.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall approve applications from no more than 6 States which have implemented comprehensive regulatory reform, and no more than 50 local educational agencies in each State local educational agencies for projects under this section that the Secretary determines show substantial promise of achieving the purposes of this section, after considering—

"(A) the comprehensiveness of the project, including the types of students, schools, programs, and activities to be included;

"(B) the extent to which the provisions for which waivers are sought impede educational improvement;

"(C) the State and local requirements that will be waived for the project;

"(D) the significance and feasibility of the proposed project's goals for each participating school or site;

"(E) the quality of the plan for ensuring accountability for the proposed plan's activities and goals; and

"(F) the comments of the Governors or the chief State school officers.

"(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall consult with the heads of other appropriate Federal agencies, if any, in determining whether to approve a project. Each such agency head shall notify the Secretary of any waivers granted by such agency head as part of such project.

"(3) DISTRIBUTION OF PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall ensure that, to the extent feasible, projects assisted under this section are geographically distributed, and equitably distributed among urban, suburban, and rural areas, as well as large and small schools.

"(e) ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS; RESTRICTION ON WAIVERS.—

"(1) ALLOCATION OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—Federal funds under any program that are used to support a project under this section shall be allocated to local educational agencies and other recipients within the local educational agency in accordance with the statutory and regulatory requirements that govern the operation of that program, except that, for the purpose of such a project, the Secretary (or the head of any other Federal agency) may extend the duration of, and provide continuation funding to, a project chosen on a competitive basis that a participating agency is conducting.

"(2) RESTRICTION ON WAIVERS.—Neither the Secretary nor the head of any other Federal agency shall waive under this section any statutory or regulatory requirement in awarding a grant after the date of enactment of the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act to a service provider within the local educational agency or other applicant participating in a project under this section.

"(3) SPECIAL RULE.—Neither the Secretary nor, where applicable, the head of any other Federal agency shall waive under this section any statutory or regulatory requirement—

"(A) under section 438 and 439 of the General Education Provisions Act;

"(B) under title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, or title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act;

"(C) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; or

"(D) relating to—

"(i) maintenance of effort;

"(ii) comparability; or

"(iii) the equitable participation of students attending private schools.

"(f) REPORTS AND EVALUATIONS.—

"(1) PROJECT REPORTS.—Each project shall submit, not later than 90 days after the end of each year of the project, an annual report to the Secretary that—

"(A) summarizes the principal activities of the project;

"(B) contains school-by-school and other data, as described in the project plan, that show the extent to which the project is meeting its overall goals, including its goals for improving the achievement of all participants, particularly disadvantaged individuals, with respect to achievement in basic and advanced skills, and is meeting the goals for each school or other site;

"(C) describes the impact of the project on disadvantaged children in schools, if any, that are not participating in the demonstration;

"(D) describes the effectiveness of efforts to coordinate programs and services for children and their families as appropriate; and

"(E) provides information on or comparable data regarding the programs described in clause (ii) of section 428B(a)(1)(B) of achievement levels of students served pursuant to such programs previously demonstrated over the preceding 3 years compared with children or students served under this title.

"(2) SECRETARY'S REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress every two years that summarizes and analyzes the project reports required by paragraph (1).

"(3) EVALUATION REPORTS.—At the end of the 6-year period described in this section, and at such interim points as the Secretary deems appropriate, the Secretary shall provide to Congress an independent evaluation of the projects assisted under this title, as well as an evaluation of the program assisted under this section by the Department of Education and other affected Federal agencies. Such reports may include recommendations for amendments to program statutes that are based on the experience of projects that successfully raise educational achievement by eliminating or modifying statutory or regulatory provisions that impede educational improvement.

"(g) DEFINITION.—For the purpose of this section, the term 'disadvantaged students' includes students of limited English proficiency, children with disabilities, students who are currently or formerly migratory, and students who are educationally deprived.

"(h) BUDGET NEUTRALITY.—The authority provided by this section shall not be exercised in a manner that, for any fiscal year,

increases total obligations or outlays of discretionary appropriations for programs subject to such authority, or that increases total obligations or outlays of funding for all direct-spending programs subject to such authority over those that would have occurred absent such authority.".

(b) SUNSET PROVISION.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective during the 6-year period beginning on the date of enactment of this Act.

TITLE IV—DISTANCE LEARNING

SEC. 401. DISTANCE LEARNING FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) distance learning technology can provide rural schools with interactive video capacity;

(2) distance learning can provide instruction in required or advanced, specialized courses in schools where teachers are not available or too costly to provide for a limited number of students;

(3) the rapid development of telecommunications technology has resulted in distance learning systems that are powerful, flexible and increasingly affordable;

(4) distance learning can offer an alternative to school closing or consolidation and help rural and urban schools satisfy their educational mandate;

(5) distance learning can help urban school districts overcome shortages in qualified teachers in subjects such as mathematics, advanced sciences, and languages;

(6) the key to success in distance learning is teachers and the use of distance learning is meant to be an enhanced educational tool for them;

(7) teachers must have training, preparation, and institutional support to teach successfully using distance learning technology;

(8) teacher accreditation associations need to encourage the use of distance learning technologies;

(9) Federal and State governments can promote distance learning projects by helping reduce the costs of necessary telecommunications services;

(10) because many educational needs parallel the needs of business, government, and health care providers, there should be ample opportunity to share the costs associated with research and development used in delivering this new method of teaching;

(11) distance learning technology can increase contributions to the goals of "America 2000", as established by the President;

(12) the Federal Government can encourage States to resolve contentious issues that are barriers to the use of distance learning, such as teacher certification and evaluation, and curriculum and textbook standardization;

(13) Federal funds now devoted to delivering educational services should include distance learning where it is cost effective;

(14) the Department of Education and the National Science Foundation should consider establishing demonstration sites for distance learning;

(15) distance learning is a growing force in private and public education; and States, localities, the Federal Government, and private sector, all have a role in developing and implementing this education delivery system.

SEC. 402. DISTANCE LEARNING POLICY STUDY.

(a) STUDY.—The Secretary of Education in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce shall conduct a study of the issues involved in implementing distance learning. The study shall, among other issues, address—

(1) the incentives necessary for telecommunications common carriers to develop special pricing for distance learning projects;

(2) the desirability of Federal Communication Commission allocation of spectrum in order to encourage the development of distance learning technologies;

(3) the need to amend copyrights laws to encourage development of distance learning technologies.

(b) COMPLETION DATE AND REPORT.—

(1) COMPLETION DATE.—The study described in subsection (a) shall be completed no later than 210 days after enactment of this Act.

(2) REPORT.—No later than 30 days after the completion of the study described in subsection (a), the study and an executive summary shall be transmitted to the Committee on Education and Labor, the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and the Committee on the Judiciary, of the United States House of Representatives; and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation, Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, of the United States Senate.

SEC. 403. DEFINITION.

The term "distance learning" means the transmission of educational or instructional information to geographically dispersed individuals and groups via telecommunications.

TITLE V—PEACE CORPS

SEC. 501. FINDINGS.

The Senate finds that—

(1) the Peace Corps Act stated that the Peace Corps was established—

(A) to help the people of interested countries and areas to meet their needs for trained manpower;

(B) to help promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of the people served; and

(C) to help promote a better understanding of other peoples on the part of Americans;

(2) the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics no longer exists, and in its place a Commonwealth of Independent States has been established, along with other newly independent republics;

(3) on December 25, 1991, President Bush indicated the United States intends to extend diplomatic recognition to Moldova, Turkmenistan, Azerbaijan, Tadzhikistan, Georgia, and Uzbekistan, when the United States reaches agreements with each republic regarding human rights, democratization, economic reform, and the establishment of responsible security policies;

(4) on December 25, 1991, the United States extended formal diplomatic recognition to Russia, Ukraine, Armenia, Kazahkstan, Byelarus, and Kyrgyzstan;

(5) the needs of the successor republics of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics for technical and humanitarian assistance are dire, and growing daily;

(6) the governments of several republics under the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics have indicated interest in receiving public and private technical assistance from the United States in the areas of agriculture, health care, business, education, and other areas;

(7) the Peace Corps has in recent years successfully met the challenges of assisting the Eastern European states of Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, and Romania, and has already begun to assess the needs of the Baltic Republics and of the former Soviet republics for such assistance;

(8) Peace Corps volunteers represent tangible support on the part of the American people for the efforts of the republics to establish market economies, democratic institutions, and low-cost, effective programs of technical assistance in the areas described in paragraph (6); and

(9) the President has indicated his support for the introduction of Peace Corps volunteers into the successor republics of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

SEC. 502. SENSE OF THE SENATE.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the Peace Corps should move promptly and effectively, as part of a balanced program and without diminishing its efforts in other parts of the world, to assess needs and establish programs in each of the republics of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics into which the Peace Corps has been or may be invited, in order to introduce appropriate numbers of Peace Corps volunteers into republics requesting assistance; and

(2) the President, consistent with clause (1), should continue to support and should accelerate the introduction of Peace Corps volunteers into the republics of the former Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS

SEC. 601. IMPROVED STATISTICS REGARDING AMERICAN SCHOOLS.

Subparagraph (C) of section 406(i)(2) of the General Education Provisions Act (20 U.S.C. 1221e-1(i)(2)(C)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating clauses (iii), (iv), and (v) as clauses (iv), (v), and (vi), respectively;

(2) by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

"(iii) The National Assessment shall—

"(I) conduct, in 1994, a trial mathematics assessment for the 4th and 8th grades and a trial reading assessment for the 4th grade, in States that wish to participate, for the purpose of determining whether such assessments yield valid and reliable State representative data;

"(II) develop, and conduct in 1994, a trial mathematics assessment for the 12th grade, a trial reading assessment for the 8th and 12th grades, and a trial science assessment for the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades, in States that wish to participate, for the purpose of determining whether such assessments yield valid and reliable State representative data; and

"(III) include in each such sample assessment described in subclauses (I) and (II) students in public and private schools in a manner that ensures comparability with the national sample.".

SEC. 602. FREEDOM OF SPEECH ON CAMPUS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

(1) free speech is a fundamental right and a safeguard against political and intellectual tyranny;

(2) curtailment of free speech strikes twice at intellectual freedom, for whoever deprives a person of the right to state unpopular views necessarily deprives other persons of the right to listen to the views;

(3) the primary and traditional function of a university is to disseminate knowledge and assist in the search for truth, and, in order to carry out the function, to do everything possible to ensure the free exchange of ideas and the fullest degree of intellectual freedom; and

(4) therefore, to carry out the function of the university, every member of the university, has an obligation to permit free expression, and every university official has a special obligation to foster freedom of speech and to ensure that the speech is not obstructed, at the university.

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that students attending universities, or other institutions of higher edu-

cation, that receive Federal funds should be able to exercise full rights to freedom of speech on campus free from official intrusion.

SEC. 603. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

In the item relating to Educational Excellence in title III of Public Law 102-170 (105 Stat. 1130) insert "or any educational reform program" after "America 2000 educational excellence activities".

SEC. 604. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORT ON THE EFFECT OF TAX INCENTIVES ON LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE.

Within 180 days after the date of enactment, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the chairman and ranking minority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources a study on the nature and extent of tax abatements given by State and local governments to attract business and the extent to which such abatements:

(1) reduce the tax base available to support public elementary and secondary education in the jurisdiction granting the abatement,

(2) reduce the funds available to support elementary and secondary schools in the jurisdiction granting the abatement, and

(3) review the extent to which citizens in the State and local community granting the abatement realize the potential impact of the abatement on funding for local public schools.

TITLE VII—DEFINITIONS

SEC. 701. DEFINITIONS.

For the purpose of this Act—

(1) the term "elementary school" has the same meaning given to such term by section 1471(8) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(2) the term "institution of higher education" has the meaning given to such term by section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965;

(3) the term "local educational agency" has the same meaning given to such term by section 1471(12) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(4) the term "new public school" means a public school that—

(A) reflects the best available knowledge regarding teaching and learning for all students;

(B) uses the highest quality instructional materials and technologies;

(C) is designed to meet National Education Goals as well as the particular needs of the students and community served by such school; and

(D) is under the authority of a State educational agency or a local educational agency;

(5) the term "New American School" means an elementary or secondary public school that—

(A) is under the authority of a State educational agency or a local educational agency;

(B) reflects the best available knowledge regarding teaching and learning for all students;

(C) uses the highest quality instructional materials and technologies; and

(D) is designed to meet the National Education Goals as well as the particular needs of the students and community served by such school;

(6) the term "Pacific outlying area" means American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and the Republic of Palau (until such time as the Compact of Free Association is ratified);

(7) the term "school dropout" has the same meaning as the definition of such term developed by the Secretary pursuant to section 6201(a) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(8) the term "secondary school" has the same meaning given to such term by section 1471(21) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965;

(9) the term "Secretary", unless otherwise specified, means the Secretary of Education;

(10) the term "school", means a public elementary or secondary school;

(11) the term "State" means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands; and

(12) the term "State educational agency" has the same meaning given to such term by section 1471(23) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the title amendment is agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote the achievement of National Education Goals, to measure progress toward such goals, to develop national education standards and voluntary assessments in accordance with such standards and to encourage the comprehensive improvement of America's neighborhood public schools to improve student achievement."

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Saunders, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

STATE OF THE UNION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 99

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered to lie on the table:

To the Congress of the United States:

Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished Members of Congress, honored guests, and fellow citizens:

I mean to speak tonight of big things; of big changes and the promises they hold, and of some big problems and how together we can solve them and move our country forward as the undisputed leader of the age.

We gather tonight at a dramatic and deeply promising time in our history, and in the history of man on earth.

For in the past twelve months the world has known changes of almost biblical proportions. And even now, months after the failed coup that doomed a failed system, I am not sure we have absorbed the full impact, the full import of what happened. But communism died this year.

Even as President, with the most fascinating possible vantage point, there were times when I was so busy helping to manage progress, and lead change, that I didn't always show the joy that was in my heart.

But the biggest thing that has happened in the world in my life—in our lives—is this: By the grace of God, America won the Cold War.

I mean to speak this evening of the changes that can take place in our country now that we can stop making the sacrifices we had to make when we had an avowed enemy that was a Superpower. Now we can look homeward even more, and move to set right what needs to be set right.

I will speak of those things. But let me tell you something I've been thinking these past few months. It's a kind of rollcall of honor. For the Cold War didn't "end"—it was won.

And I think of those who won it, in places like Korea, and Vietnam. And some of them didn't come back. Back then they were heroes, but this year they became what they didn't know they were: victors.

The long rollcall—all the G.I. Joes and Janes, all the ones who fought faithfully for freedom, who hit the ground and sucked the dust and knew their share of horror.

This may seem frivolous—I don't mean it so—but it's moving to me how the world saw them.

The world saw not only their special valor but their special style—their rambunctious, optimistic bravery, their do-or-die unity unhampered by class or race or region. What a group we've put forth, for generations now—from the ones who wrote "Kilroy was Here" on the walls of German stalags, to those who left signs in the Iraqi desert that said, "I Saw Elvis." What a group of kids we've sent into the world.

And there's another to be singled out—though it may seem inelegant. I mean a mass of people called The American Taxpayer. No one ever thinks to thank the people who pay a country's bills, or an alliance's bills.

But for half a century now the American people have shouldered the burden, and paid taxes that were higher than they would have been to support a defense that was bigger than it would have been if imperial communism had never existed.

But it did.

But it doesn't anymore.

And here is a fact I wouldn't mind the world acknowledging: The American taxpayer bore the brunt of the burden, and deserves a hunk of the glory.

And so, now, for the first time in 35 years, our strategic bombers stand down. No longer are they on 'round-the-clock alert. Tomorrow our children will go to school and study history and how plants grow. And they won't have, as my children did, air raid drills in which they crawl under their desks and cover their heads in case of nuclear war. My grandchildren don't have to do that, and won't have the bad dreams children had once, in decades past. There are still threats. But the long, drawn out dread is over.

A year ago tonight I spoke to you at a moment of high peril. American forces had just unleashed Operation Desert Storm. And after forty days in the desert skies, and four days on the ground, the men and women of America's Armed Forces, and our allies, accomplished the goals that I declared, and that you endorsed: We liberated Kuwait.

Soon after, the Arab world and Israel sat down to talk seriously, and comprehensively, about peace—an historic first. And soon after that, at Christmas, the last American hostages came home. Our policies were vindicated.

Much good can come from the prudent use of power. And much good can come of this: A world once divided into two armed camps now recognizes one sole and pre-eminent power: the United States of America.

And they regard this with no dread. For the world trusts us with power—and the world is right. They trust us to be fair, and restrained, they trust us to be on the side of decency. They trust us to do what's right.

I use those words advisedly. A few days after the war began I received a telegram from Joanne Speicher, the wife of the first pilot killed in the Gulf, Lt. Commander Scott Speicher. Even in her grief she wanted me to know that some day, when her children were old enough, she would tell them ". . . that their father went away to war because it was the right thing to do."

She said it all. It was the right thing to do.

And we did it together. There were honest differences here, in this Chamber. But when the war began, you put partisanship aside, and supported our troops.

This is still a time for pride—but this is no time to boast. For problems face us, and we must stand together once again and solve them—and not let our country down.

Two years ago I began planning cuts in military spending that reflected the changes of the new era. But now, this year, with imperial communism gone, that process can be accelerated.

Tonight I can tell you of dramatic changes in our strategic nuclear force. These are actions we are taking on our own—because they are the right thing to do.

After completing 20 planes for which we have begun procurement, we will shutdown further production of the B-2 bomber. We will cancel the small I.C.B.M. program. We will cease production of new warheads for our sea-based ballistic missiles. We will stop all new production of the Peacekeeper missile. And we will not purchase any more advanced cruise missiles.

This weekend I will meet at Camp David with Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation. I have informed President Yeltsin that if the Commonwealth—the former Soviet Union—will eliminate all land-based multiple warhead ballistic missiles, I will do the following:

We will eliminate all Peacekeeper missiles. We will reduce the number of warheads on Minuteman missiles to one, and reduce the number of warheads on our sea-based missiles by about one-third. And we will convert a substantial portion of our strategic bombers to primarily conventional use.

President Yeltsin's early response has been very positive, and I expect our talks at Camp David to be fruitful.

I want you to know that for half a century, American presidents have longed to make such decisions and say such words. But even in the midst of celebration, we must keep caution as a friend.

For the world is still a dangerous place. Only the dead have seen the end of conflict. And though yesterday's challenges are behind us, tomorrow's are being born.

The Secretary of Defense recommended these cuts after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And I make them with confidence. But do not misunderstand me:

The reductions I have approved will save us an additional 50 billion dollars over the next five years. By 1997 we will have cut defense by 30% since I took office. These cuts are deep, and you must know my resolve: This deep, and no deeper.

To do less would be insensible to progress—but to do more would be ignorant of history.

We must not go back to the days of "the hollow army". We cannot repeat the mistakes made twice in this century, when armistice was followed by recklessness, and defense was purged as if the world were permanently safe.

I remind you this evening that I have asked for your support in funding a program to protect our country from limited nuclear missile attack. We must have this protection because too many people in too many countries have access to nuclear arms.

There are those who say that now we can turn away from the world, that we have no special role, no special place.

But we are the United States of America, the leader of the west that has become the leader of the world.

As long as I am President we will continue to lead in support of freedom everywhere—not out of arrogance, and not out of altruism, but for the safety and security of our children.

This is a fact: Strength in the pursuit of peace is no vice; isolationism in the pursuit of security is no virtue. Now to our troubles at home. They are not all economic, but the primary problem is our economy. There are some good signs: Inflation, that thief, is down; and interest rates are down. But unemployment is too high, some industries are in trouble, and growth is not what it should be.

Let me tell you right from the start and right from the heart: I know we're in hard times, but I know something else: This will not stand.

My friends in this Chamber: We can bring the same courage and sense of common purpose to the economy that we brought to Desert Storm. And we can defeat hard times together.

I believe you will help. One reason is that you're patriots, and you want the best for your country. And I believe that in your hearts you want to put partisanship aside and get the job done—because it's the right thing to do.

The power of America rests in a stirring but simple idea: That people will do great things if only you set them free.

Well, we're going to set the economy free, for if this age of miracles and wonders has taught us anything, it's that if we can change the world, we can change America.

We must encourage investment. We must make it easier for people to invest money and create new products, new industries, and new jobs. We must clear away the obstacles to growth—high taxes, high regulation, red tape, and yes, wasteful government spending.

None of this will happen with a snap of the fingers—but it will happen. And the test of a plan isn't whether it's called new or dazzling. The American people aren't impressed by gimmicks; they're smarter on this score than all of us in this room. The only test of a plan is: Is it sound and will it work?

We must have a short term plan to address our immediate needs, and heat up the economy. And we need a long term plan to keep the combustion going, and to guarantee our place in the world economy.

There are certain things that a President can do without Congress—And I am going to do them.

I have this evening asked major cabinet departments and federal agencies to institute a 90 day moratorium on any new federal regulations that could hinder growth. In those 90 days major departments and agencies will carry out a top to bottom review of all regulations, old and new—to stop the ones that will hurt growth, and speed up those that will help growth.

Further, for the untold number of hard working, responsible American workers and businessmen and women, who've been forced to go without needed bank loans: The banking credit crunch must end. I won't neglect my responsibility for sound regulations that serve the public good, but regulatory overkill must be stopped.

And I have instructed our government regulators to stop it.

I have directed cabinet departments, and federal agencies, to speed up progrowth expenditures as quickly as possible. This should put an extra 10 billion dollars into the economy in the next 6 months. And our new transportation bill provides more than 150 billion dollars for construction and maintenance projects that are vital to our growth and well being. That means jobs building roads, jobs building bridges, and jobs building railways.

I have this evening directed the Secretary of the Treasury to change the federal tax withholding tables. With this change, millions of Americans from whom the government withholds more than necessary can now choose to have the government withhold less from their paychecks. Something tells me a number of taxpayers may take us up on this. This initiative could return about 25 billion dollars back into our economy over the next 12 months—money people can use to help pay for clothing, college, or to get a new car.

Finally, working with the Federal Reserve, we will continue to support monetary policy that keeps both interest rates and inflation down.

These are the things I can do. And now, members of Congress, let me tell you what you can do for your country. You must pass the other elements of my plan to meet our immediate economic needs.

Everyone knows that investment spurs recovery.

I am proposing this evening a change in the alternative minimum tax, and the creation of a new 15% investment tax allowance. This will encourage businesses to accelerate investment and bring people back to work.

Real estate has led our economy out of almost all the tough times we've ever had. Once building starts, carpenters and plumbers work and people buy homes and take out mortgages.

My plan would modify the Passive Loss Rule for active real estate developers. And it would make it easier for pension plans to purchase real estate.

For those Americans who dream of buying a first home, but who can't quite afford it, my plan would allow first time home buyers to withdraw savings from I.R.A.'s without penalty—and provide a five thousand dollar tax credit for the first purchase of that home.

And finally, my immediate plan calls on Congress to give crucial help to people who own a home, to everyone who has a business, or a farm, or a single investment.

This time, at this hour, I cannot take No for an answer: You must cut the capital gains tax on the people of our country.

Never has an issue been more demagogued by its opponents. But the demagogues are wrong—and they know it. Sixty percent of the people who benefit from lower capital gains have incomes under 50 thousand dollars. A cut in the capital gains tax increases jobs and helps just about everyone in our country.

And I'll tell you, those of you who say, "Oh no, someone who's comfortable may benefit from this." You kind of remind me of the old definition of the Puritan, who couldn't sleep at night worrying that somehow someone somewhere was out having a good time.

The opponents of this measure—and those who've authored various so called soak-the-rich bills that are floating around this chamber—should be reminded of something: When they aim at the big guy they usually hit the little guy. And maybe it's time that stopped.

This then is my short term plan. Your part, members of Congress, requires enactment of these common sense proposals that will have a strong effect on the economy—without breaking the budget agreement and without raising tax rates.

While my plan is being passed and kicking in, we've got to care for those in trouble today. I have provided up to 4.4 billion dollars in my budget to extend Federal unemployment benefits. I ask for Congressional action right away.

And let's be frank:

I know, and you know, that my plan is unveiled in a political season. I know, and you know, that everything I propose will be viewed by some in merely partisan terms. But I ask you to know what is in my heart: My aim is to increase our nation's good. I am doing what I think is right; I am proposing what I know will help.

I pride myself that I am a prudent man. I believe that patience is a virtue, but I understand that politics is, for some, a game—and that sometimes the game is to stop all progress and then decry the lack of improvement.

But let me tell you: far more important than my political future—and far more important than yours—is the well being of our country. Members of this Chamber are practical people, and I know you won't resent some practical advice: When people put their party's fortunes before the public good, they court defeat not only for their country, but for themselves. And they will certainly deserve it.

I submit my plan tomorrow. I am asking you to pass it by March 20th. And I ask the American people to let you know they want this action by March 20th.

From the day after that, if it must be: the battle is joined.

And you know, when principle is at stake I relish a good fair fight.

I said my plan has two parts, and it does. And it is the second part that is the heart of the matter. For it's not enough to get an immediate burst—we need long term improvement in our economic position.

We all know that the key to our economic future is to ensure that America continues as the economic leader of the world. We have that in our power.

Here, then, is my long term plan to guarantee our future.

First, trade: We will work to break down the walls that stop world trade. We will work to open markets everywhere.

In our major trade negotiations I will continue pushing to eliminate tariffs and subsidies that damage America's farmers and workers. And we'll get more good American jobs within our own hemisphere through the North American Free Trade Agreement, and through the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative.

But changes are here, and more are coming. The workplace of the future will demand more highly skilled workers than ever—more people who are computer literate, and highly educated.

We must be the world's leader in education. We must revolutionize America's schools.

My America 2000 education strategy will help us reach that goal. My plan will give parents more choice, give teachers more flexibility, and help communities create New American Schools.

Thirty states across the nation have established America 2000 programs. Hundreds of cities and towns have joined in.

Now Congress must join this great movement: Pass my proposals for New American Schools.

That was my second long term proposal. This is my third:

We must make common sense investments that will help us compete, long term, in the marketplace.

We must encourage research and development. My plan is to make the R and D tax credit permanent, and to provide record levels of support—over 76 billion dollars this year alone—for people who will explore the promise of emerging technologies.

Fourth, we must do something about crime, and drugs.

It is time for a major, renewed investment in fighting violent street crime. It saps our strength and hurts our faith in our society, and in our future together.

Surely a tired woman on her way to work at 6 in the morning on a subway deserves the right to get there safely. Surely it's true that everyone who changes his or her life because of crime—from those afraid to go out at night to those afraid to walk in the parks they pay for—surely these people have been denied a basic civil right.

It is time to restore it. Congress, pass my comprehensive crime bill. It is tough on criminals and supportive of police—and it has been languishing in these hallowed halls for years now.

Pass it. Help your country.

Fifth, I ask you tonight to fund our H.O.P.E. housing proposal—and to pass my Enterprise Zone legislation, which will get businesses into the inner city. We must empower the poor with the pride that comes from owning a home, getting a job, becoming a part of things.

My plan would encourage real estate construction by extending tax incentives for mortgage revenue bonds and low income housing.

And I ask tonight for record expenditures for the program that helps children born into want move into excellence: Head Start.

Step six—we must reform our health care system. For this too bears on whether or not we can compete in the world.

American health costs have been exploding. This year America will spend over 800 billion dollars on health. And that's expected to grow to 1.6 trillion by the end of the decade. We simply cannot afford this.

The cost of health care shows up not only in your family budget, but in the price of everything we buy and everything we sell. When health coverage for a fellow on an assembly line costs thousands of dollars, the cost goes into the products he makes—and you pay the bill.

We must make a choice.

Some pretend we can have it both ways. They call it Play or Pay—but that expensive approach is unstable. It will mean higher taxes, fewer jobs and, eventually, a system under complete government control.

Really, there are only two options: We can move toward a nationalized system—which will restrict patient choice in picking a doctor and force the government to ration services arbitrarily. And what we'll get is patients in long lines, indifferent service, and a huge new tax burden.

Or we can reform our own private health care system—which still gives us, for all its flaws, the best quality health care in the world.

Well, let's build on our strengths.

My plan provides insurance security for all Americans—while preserving and increasing the idea of choice. We make basic health insurance affordable for all low income people not now covered. We do it by providing a health insurance tax credit of up to $3,750 for each low income family. The middle class gets new help too. And, by reforming the health insurance market, my plan assures that Americans will have access to basic health insurance even if they change jobs or develop serious health problems.

We must bring costs under control, preserve quality, preserve choice, and reduce the people's nagging daily worry about health insurance. My plan, the details of which I will announce shortly, does just that.

Seventh, we must get the federal deficit under control.

We now have in law enforceable spending caps, a requirement that we pay for the programs we create.

There are those in Congress who would ease that discipline now. But I cannot let them do it—and I won't.

My plan would freeze all domestic discretionary budget authority—which means "No more next year than this year." I will not tamper with Social Security, but I would put real caps on the growth of uncontrolled spending. I would also freeze federal domestic government employment.

With the help of Congress, my plan will get rid of 246 programs that don't deserve federal funding. Some of them have noble titles, but none of them is indispensable. We can get rid of each and every one of them.

You know, it's time we rediscovered a 'home truth' the American people have never forgotten: This government is too big and spends too much.

I call upon Congress to adopt a measure that will help put an end to the annual ritual of filling the budget with pork-barrel appropriations. Every year, the press has a field day making fun of outrageous examples—a Lawrence Welk museum, a research grant for Belgian Endive.

We all know how these things get into the budget. Maybe you need someone to help you say No. I know how to say it. And you know what I need to make it stick. Give me the same thing 43 Governors have: The line item veto.

We must put an end to unfinanced federal government mandates. These are the requirements Congress puts on our cities, counties and states—without supplying the money. If Congress passes a mandate, it should be forced to pay for it, and to balance the cost with savings elsewhere. After all, a mandate just increases someone else's burden—and that means higher taxes at the state and local level.

Step Eight: Congress should enact the bold reform proposals that are still awaiting Congressional action—bank reform, civil justice reform, tort reform, and my national energy strategy.

Finally: We must strengthen the family—because it is the family that has the greatest bearing on our future. When Barbara holds an AIDS baby in her arms, and reads to children, she's saying to every person in this country "Family matters."

I am announcing tonight a new Commission on America's Urban Families. You know, I had mayors from the League of Cities in the other day, and they told me something striking. They said that every one of them, Republicans and Democrats, agreed on one thing: That the major cause of the problems of the cities is the dissolution of the family.

They asked for this Commission, and they were right to ask, because it's time to determine what we can do to keep families together, strong and sound.

There's one thing we can do right away: ease the burden of rearing a child. I ask you tonight to raise the personal exemption by five hundred dollars per child for every family. For a family with four kids, that's an increase of two thousand dollars. This is a good start, in the right direction, and it's what we can afford.

It's time to allow families to deduct the interest they pay on student loans. I am asking you to do just that. And I'm asking you to allow people to use money from their I.R.A.'s to pay medical and education expenses—all without penalties.

And I'm asking for more. Ask American parents what they dislike about how things are in our country, and chances are good that pretty soon they'll get to welfare.

Americans are the most generous people on earth. But we have to go back to the insight of Franklin Roosevelt who, when he spoke of what became the welfare program, warned that it must not become "a narcotic" and a "subtle destroyer" of the spirit.

Welfare was never meant to be a lifestyle; it was never meant to be a habit; it was never supposed to be passed from generation to generation like a legacy.

It's time to replace the assumptions of the welfare state, and help reform the welfare system.

States throughout the country are beginning to operate with new assumptions: That when able-bodied adults receive government assistance, they have responsibilities to the taxpayer. A responsibility to seek work, education, or job training—a responsibility to get their lives in order—a responsibility to hold their families together and refrain from having children out of wedlock—and a responsibility to obey the law.

We are going to help this movement. Often, state reform requires waiving certain federal regulations. I will act to make that process easier and quicker for every state that asks our help.

And I want to add, as we make these changes, that our intention isn't

scapegoating or finger pointing. If you read the papers or watch TV you know there's been a rise these days in a certain kind of bitterness, racist comments, anti-semitism, an increased sense of division.

Really, this is not us. This is not who we are. And this is not acceptable.

And so you have my plan for America. I am asking for big things—but I believe in my heart you will do what's right.

You know, it's kind of an American tradition to show a certain skepticism toward our democratic institutions. I myself have sometimes thought the aging process could be delayed if it had to make its way through Congress.

You will deliberate, and you will discuss, and that is fine.

But, my friends: the people cannot wait. They need help now.

There is a mood among us. People are worried, there has been talk of decline. Someone even said our workers are lazy and uninspired.

And I thought, really. Go tell Neil Armstrong standing on the moon. Tell the men and women who put him there. Tell the American farmer who feeds his country and the world. Tell the men and women of Desert Storm.

Moods come and go, but greatness endures.

Ours does.

And maybe for a moment it's good to remember what, in the dailyness of our lives, we forget:

We are still and ever the freest nation on earth—the kindest nation on earth—the strongest nation on earth—

And we have always risen to the occasion.

We are going to lift this nation out of hard times inch by inch and day by day, and those who would stop us had best step aside. Because I look at hard times and I make this vow: This will not stand.

And so we move on, together, a rising nation, the once and future miracle that is still, this night, the hope of the world.

Thank you. God bless you. God bless our beloved country.

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

At 2:45 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mr. Hays, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has agreed to the following concurrent resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H. Con. Res. 267. A concurrent resolution relative to a joint session of the two Houses of Congress on Tuesday, January 28, 1992, to receive a communication from the President of the United States.

The message also announced that the House has agreed to the following resolution:

H. Res. 329. A resolution informing the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 102–138, the Speaker appoints from private life Mr. Ben J. Wattenberg of Washington, DC, and Mr. Leonard H. Marks of Washington, DC, to the Commission on Broadcasting to the People's Republic of China on the part of the House.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 5(a)(2) of Public Law 101–363, the minority leader appoints Mrs. MORELLA to serve as a member on the part of the House of the National Advisory Council on the Public Service Act of 1990.

The message further announced that pursuant to the provisions of Public Law 102–138, on November 22, 1991, the minority leader notified the President of his appointment from private life of Mr. Steven Mosher of Upland, CA, and Mr. James L. Tyson of Darien, CT, to the Commission on Broadcasting to the People's Republic of China on the part of the House.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of section 5506(a) of Public Law 100–297, on April 25, 1991, the Speaker designated the following as members of the Advisory Committee of the White House Conference on Indian Education on the part of the House: Representatives CAMPBELL of Colorado and BARRETT; and from private life: Mr. Don Barlow of Spokane, WA, Mr. Joseph Martin of Kayenta, AZ, and Mrs. Kathryn D. Manuelito of Albuquerque, NM.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–2447. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Energy (Fossil Energy), transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of the Department's designation of an additional candidate site for the expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve to one billion barrels; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–2448. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cumulative report on budget rescissions and deferrals dated January 9, 1992, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Finance, and the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–2449. A communication from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, the final sequestration report for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, the Committee on Armed Services, to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Special Committee on Aging, the Select Committee on Intelligence, and Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC–2450. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a cumulative report on budget rescissions and deferrals dated January 13, 1992, pursuant to the order of January 30, 1975, as modified by the order of April 11, 1986, referred jointly to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition and Forestry, the Committee on Armed Services, the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, the Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, the Committee on Environment and Public Works, the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Governmental Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, the Committee on Rules and Administration, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Select Committee on Indian Affairs, the Select Committee on Intelligence, the Special Committee on Aging, and the Select Committee on POW/MIA Affairs.

EC–2451. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury (Enforcement), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the effectiveness and utility of the reporting requirements of the Bank Secrecy Act and section 6050I of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–2452. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the extension of the export controls maintained for foreign policy purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–2453. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the government securities market; to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

EC–2454. A communication from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, transmitting, pursuant to law, a sequestration preview report for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977; referred jointly to the Committee on the Budget, and to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC–2455. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, certification for the country of Suriname; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–2456. A communication from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant

to law, an annual report on the activities of the National Technical Information Service for fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2457. A communication from the Acting Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Joint Task Force Report on Offshore Pipelines"; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2458. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the countries of Costa Rica, France, Italy, Japan, and Panama being under an embargo; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2459. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning the countries of Venezuela and Vanuatu being under a court-ordered embargo; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2460. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the independent certified public accountants' audit of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline Liability Fund's financial statements as of December 31, 1990; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2461. A communication from the Acting Deputy Associate Director for Collection and Disbursement, Minerals Management Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the refund of certain offshore lease revenues; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2462. A communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on mining and mineral resources; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2463. A communication from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 to authorize Federal agencies to purchase helium from the private sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2464. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works), transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report of the task force; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2465. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation to rename the Klamath Forest National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2466. A communication from the Administrator of the General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report for fiscal 1991; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2467. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the activities of Foreign-Trade Zones Board for fiscal year 1990; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2468. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the United States Government for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1991; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2469. A communication from the Administrator for the Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the Program's portfolio and finances; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2470. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report regarding El Salvador; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2471. A communication from the Assistant Legal Adviser of State (Legislative Affairs), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States in the sixty day period prior to January 16, 1992; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2472. A communication from the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on civil monetary penalty assessments, collections, and status of receivables for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2473. A communication from the Chairman of the Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the status of the entity's audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2474. A communication from the Director of Office and Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on civil monetary penalty assessments, collections, and status of receivables for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2475. A communication from the Acting Administrator of the Agency for International Development, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on management control and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2476. A communication from the Head of the Bureau of Naval Personnel (Personnel Benefits), Department of the Navy, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report for the Navy Nonappropriated Fund Retirement Plan of Employees of Civilian Morale, Welfare and Recreation; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2477. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Commission's internal control and financial systems in effect during fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2478. A communication from the Executive Director of the Marine Mammal Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on audit and investigative activities for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2479. A communication from the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on management controls and financial management systems for fiscal year 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2480. A communication from the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Audit of the District Government's Contributions to the Morris Fitzgerald Memorial Tennis Stadium"; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2481. A communication from the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report evaluating the need to extend interim geographic adjustments to Federal General Schedule employees in additional geographic areas.

EC-2482. A communication from the Federal Co-Chairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report evaluating the system of internal accounting and administrative control of the Commission in effect during the year ended September 30, 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2483. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report analyzing the factors contributing to the 1991 budget misestimate; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2484. A communication from the Secretary of the Mississippi River Commission, Department of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report of the Commission under the Government in the Sunshine Act covering calendar year 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2485. A communication from the Chairman of the Board of Governors, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report regarding the compliance of the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service with the requirements of the Government in the Sunshine Act for calendar year 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2486. A communication from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on internal controls and financial systems in effect during 1991; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2487. A communication from the Acting Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report in opposition to enactment of bills providing legislative Federal recognition to Indian groups; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2488. A communication from the Chairman of the National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Commission for fiscal year 1991; to the Select Committee on Indian Affairs.

EC-2489. A communication from the Chairman, Board of Directors, of the State Justice Institute, transmitting, pursuant to law, a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the purposes of carrying out the activities of the State Justice Institute for fiscal years 1993, 1994, 1995, and 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC-2490. A communication from the Chairperson, Advisory Panel on Alzheimer's Disease, the Burke Rehabilitation Center, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report reflecting the work of the Panel during 1991; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources.

EC-2491. A communication from the Administrator of the National Aeronautics Space Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report on the performance of NASA's Industrial Applications Centers and on their interaction with the nation's small business community; to the Committee on Small Business.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM-263. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 13

"Whereas, The recent freeze during December 1990, and January 1991, was the third

worst natural disaster that ever occurred in the State of California with respect to the economy of this state, ranking behind the 1906 San Francisco and Loma Prieta earthquakes; and

"Whereas, This record freeze was unique since it consisted of low temperatures for an extended period of time. In many locations of the state the temperatures dropped below 20 degrees Fahrenheit and remained at those temperatures for seven consecutive days; and

"Whereas, This caused extensive damage to the agricultural industry in the state with the loss of crops alone estimated to be in a range between $750 and $900 million and could reach as high as $1.3 billion; and

"Whereas, The freezing temperatures affected many crops in the state. The most severely damaged crops were: navel and valencia oranges, lemons, grapefruit, avocados, strawberries, melons, sugar beets, broccoli, cauliflower, artichokes, winter vegetables, flowers, and nursery stocks; and

"Whereas, The freeze caused extensive damage to citrus budwood, which impacts the ability of nurseries to produce trees for replanting for orchards of the affected areas, especially young orchards where extensive replanting will be required; and

"Whereas, New trees will take five to seven years of growth before they reach full production, and lemon trees that sustained heavy damage will take three to five years to recover from the freeze; and

"Whereas, In addition to the loss of crops on the trees and in fields, producers of agricultural products incurred significant energy expenses and capital losses from damage to irrigation systems and equipment breakdowns; and

"Whereas, The damage to the agricultural industry had the effect of causing the unemployment of approximately 15,000 skilled, full-time workers and economic depression in many rural counties of the state whose residents depend heavily on agriculture as their primary source of income; and

"Whereas, The families in those areas, with already marginal incomes, will have to make decisions to either purchase food or pay for housing and utilities; now, therefore, be it.

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorialize the President and Congress of the United States to enact legislation to appropriate the necessary funds to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service to provide relief to the producers of agricultural products affected by the recent freeze in this state; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That funds be allocated to the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants available for providing emergency services to low-income migrant and seasonal farmworkers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That funds be allocated to the Secetary of Agriculture to provide emergency crop assistance to eligible producers of agricultural products in the State of California pursuant to the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-624); and be it further

"*Resolved*, That Section 2272 of the Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act of 1990 should not apply with regard to those appropriated funds; and be it further.

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Agriculture, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service."

PM-264. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Armed Services:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 21

"Whereas, The Department of the Army has announced a reduction in the size of the reserve forces, including the National Guard; and

"Whereas, The California Army National Guard would be required to reduce in size by 32 percent, a loss of about 7,000 soldier positions; and

"Whereas, The California Army National Guard is the sole and irreplaceable military force legally available and equipped to respond immediately to natural disasters and other emergencies at the direction of the Governor; and

"Whereas, The planned reduction will drastically and dangerously impair the capability of the state to respond quickly to the larger number of emergencies which occur annually in California and the constant potential for wildfires, floods, and earthquakes of catastrophic proportion; and

"Whereas, The State of California is projected to dramatically increase in population in the next decade, increasing the potential magnitude of human risk from natural disaster; and

"Whereas, The state supports the reduction of the federal Armed Forces and of the costs to maintain them in time of peace; and

"Whereas, Reserve forces can be maintained in peacetime at about one-third the cost of active duty forces, and can be maintained combat ready and deployable on short notice as demonstrated in Operation Desert Storm; and

"Whereas, The citizens of the State of California object to a reduction in the California Army National Guard force structure; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature and the citizens of the State of California strongly urge the President of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, and the Congress of the United States to direct that the authorized strength of the force structure of the California Army National Guard shall not be reduced; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of Defense of the United States, and to the Governor and the Adjutant General of the State of California."

POM-265. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 24

"Whereas, This country maintains a dual banking system whereby banks in California may elect whether to be state chartered banks subject to regulation by the State Banking Department or federally chartered banks subject to regulation by the Comptroller of the Currency; and

"Whereas, The State Banking Department is authorized to approve all applications for state chartered banks to engage in the business of banking in this state; and

"Whereas, State chartered banks in California are allowed to provide certain products and services under California law that federally chartered banks are not allowed to provide under current federal law; and

"Whereas, California banking laws promote capital availability, strengthen economic development, and encourage community reinvestment in this state; and

"Whereas, It is of great importance that the State of California retain the ability to equitably tax both state and federally chartered banks; and

"Whereas, The United States Treasury recently proposed a plan to reform and restructure this country's financial system by reducing or eliminating state regulation of banks in favor of increased regulation by the Federal Reserve; and

"Whereas, The Legislature of the State of California reaffirms and restates its support for the continuation of the dual banking system in California; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President, the Congress, and the Treasury Department to retain and continue the essential components of the dual banking system and ensure that any reforms to the federal deposit insurance system apply equally to all depositors in financial institutions of any size; and recognize that it is imperative that any changes in federal banking laws not impair the ability of the State of California to tax banks in this state; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the United States Secretary of the Treasury."

POM-266. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 9

"Whereas, A recent ground collision between a USAir jetliner and a commuter plane, which has so far left 34 people dead, has been attributed to air controller error and malfunctioning radar; and

"Whereas, Those conditions might have been prevented had the Aviation Trust Fund spent some of the $10 billion it has set aside for modernization of the nation's air traffic control system; and

"Whereas, Air traffic controllers, trained and hired by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), are short an estimated 3,000 controllers nationwide, according to the National Air Traffic Controllers Association, and some of these, according to Los Angeles Times research, appear to receive inadequate training at smaller airports before being stationed at major airports such as Los Angeles International Airport (LAX); now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to improve air safety at major United States airports, including provisions for a review of the number of air traffic controllers hired and trained since the 1981 strike, a determination of the additional number of controllers needed and the percentage of current controllers rated at full-performance level,

and an investigation of the need for measures to facilitate emergency operations in the event of massive casualties in airport crashes; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California supports the implementation by the Federal Aviation Administration of internationally recognized standards of safety relative to uniform runway and taxiway operational parameters; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California requests an investigation by the Federal Aviation Administration into the interior safety of airplanes in regard to the flammability of, and the potential to produce toxic smoke, in materials used; and be further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California requests the federal government to assist in the expeditious building, staffing, and operation of a new replacement air traffic control tower at Los Angeles International Airport (LAX); and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California supports the expeditious release and appropriation by the Congress of moneys in the Airport and Airways Trust Fund; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California supports the expeditious implementation of the National Airspace System Plan and the procurement of Improved Airport Surface Detection Equipment (ASDE-3 radar) by the Federal Aviation Administration at all California commercial airports; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-267. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; ordered to lie on the table:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 48

"Whereas, Congress has passed the Unemployment Insurance Reform Act of 1991 (hereafter the "Act"); and

"Whereas, The Act will provide 550,000 people in California, who have lost jobs covered by the unemployment insurance system, with 13 weeks of unemployment benefits, in addition to the 26 weeks of benefits that are provided under current law; and

"Whereas, Nationwide, the Act will provide up to 20 weeks of extra compensation to 3 million unemployed workers; and

"Whereas, The Act authorizes four levels of weeks of eligibility for extended unemployment benefits. The number of weeks of benefits payable to an unemployed worker in a particular state would be determined by the state's total unemployment rate; and

"Whereas, In California, where the unemployment rate fluctuates around 7 percent, workers who lost their jobs would be eligible under this Act for 39 weeks of unemployment compensation; and

"Whereas, The Act authorizes benefits to be paid from September 1, 1991, to July 4, 1992; and

"Whereas, In order to obtain President George Bush's signature on the Act, it was amended to require a separate emergency designation to be declared in order to release the $5.3 billion in federally paid benefits; and

"Whereas, The President has indicated that he will not sign an emergency declaration despite the nation's recession which has left many middle class Americans without jobs; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President of the United States to sign a declaration of emergency to release the $5.3 billion in extended emergency unemployment benefits; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That in the event the President does not sign a declaration of emergency to implement those provisions of the Act that would release moneys for extended emergency unemployment benefits, that Congress pursue the original version of the bill that would have considered a signature on the legislation to be a declaration of an emergency; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-268. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 28

"Whereas, On July 14, 1991, a major derailment in Shasta County, California between Dunsmuir and Mount Shasta involving a Southern Pacific Transportation Company freight train caused a single-wall tank car to spill its contents of the chemical metam sodium into the Sacramento River, fouling the river, killing fish and wildlife, and sickening some nearby residents; and

"Whereas, Between 1976 and 1990, 43 derailments or other accidents have occurred on this 20-mile section of track, and the metam sodium spill is the 20th rail accident in the past 15 years on the same three miles of track; and

"Whereas, Single-wall rail tank cars experience punctures, and resultant dangerous leaks, in accidents twice as often as double-wall rail tank cars; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the California Legislature respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to do all of the following:

"(1) Require the United States Department of Transportation to adopt an emergency regulation to immediately reclassify metam sodium as a hazardous substance so that it may be transported only in double-wall rail tank cars appropriately placarded and then adopt a regulation through the regular process with the same effect;

"(2) Require the United States Department of Transportation to investigate and review other chemical compounds not presently considered to be hazardous or toxic for possible reclassification as hazardous substances; and

"(3) Require the Federal Railroad Administration to increase the enforcement of rail speed limitations and the National Transportation Safety Board to investigate conditions on the 20-mile section of track between Dunsmuir and Mount Shasta; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the United States Department of Transportation, to the Federal Railroad Administration, and to the National Transportation Safety Board."

POM-269. A resolution adopted by the Common Council of Buffalo, New York; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

POM-270. A resolution adopted by the Twenty-First Guam Legislature favoring legislation to amend the Organic Act of Guam relative to the authority and jurisdiction of the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"RESOLUTION NO. 132

"Whereas, in September, 1968, as a pre-requisite and requisite to the extension of a basic democratic principle—that the people of Guam have the inalienable right to democratically elect the Governor of Guam,—the Organic Act of Guam was amended to grant the Office of the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior "carte blanche" jurisdiction and authority to "audit all accounts pertaining to the revenue and receipts of the government of Guam, and the authority to audit, in accordance with law and administrative regulations, all expenditures of funds or uses of property which are irregular or not pursuant to law"; and

"Whereas, after years of yearning for the basic right to elect their Governor and in order not to endanger the passage of the Elective Governor law, the people of Guam passively accepted this onerous amendment to the Organic Act; and

"Whereas, the people of Guam, over the last few years, have seen and have been subjected to blatant and unnecessary abuses of the authority and jurisdiction granted in §9-A (1) & (2) of the Organic Act which give the Inspector General such extraordinary power; and

"Whereas, such blatant and unnecessary abuses of power include the decision by the Inspector General to violate the sanctity of the tax records of individual citizens of Guam by demanding and obtaining, through the federal courts, the authority to audit individual and unnamed tax returns despite the strenuous objections of the Tax Commissioner, the Governor of Guam and the Guam Legislature and despite the fact that the Tax Commissioner, did, in fact, offer access to the Inspector General to those same records so long as the names of the individual taxpayer could be blacked out in order to protect the confidentiality and sanctity of the tax system; and

"Whereas, the Office of the Inspector General, a division of the Department of the Interior, itself an agency of the Executive Branch of the United States government, has elected to conduct audits, not only of the accounts, but also of the management practices of the Guam Legislature, in total and blatant disregard of the ineluctable fact that the Guam Legislature is a legislative body whose power extends to all subjects of legislation of local application and which power includes the authority to determine its own rules; and

"Whereas, despite the Guam Legislature's legislative authority and power to determine its own rules, the Office of the Inspector General elected to pass judgment on the use of said authority and power, clearly exhibiting a total disregard for the basic provisions of the Organic Act which provisions are but reflections and mirror images of the American principle of separation of powers; and

"Whereas, the Office of the Inspector General has and will continue to attempt to un-

dermine the legislative authority of the Guam Legislature and the respect of the people of Guam in those who they have elected to that office, as well as in the officials of the Executive Branch of the government of Guam, its agencies, departments, functions and programs, by initiating releases to Guam's media of what is essentially only the biased opinion of the Office of the Inspector General on the operations of the Guam Legislature and other agencies, departments, functions and programs of the government of Guam, despite the fact that serious questions exist and have been raised relative to the authority of the Inspector General to audit the Guam Legislature and to whom the Inspector General is to report the results of such audit without violating the principles of separation of powers; and

"Whereas, by electing to release to Guam's media what is essentially its own opinion, the Office of the Inspector General has chosen to embark into the world of local politics, thereby compromising the very intent for the establishment of the Office of Inspector General for Guam, since by choosing to politicize its audits and reports it is attempting to politically influence the people of Guam by casting aspersions and doubts on the elected leaders of Guam and on the heads of its agencies, departments, programs and functions; and

"Whereas, the Guam Legislature has, continues, and will continue to question the authority of the Inspector General to audit the operations, management and accounts of the Guam Legislature and those departments, agencies, functions and programs of the government of Guam which do not receive federal funding but which are funded by the general revenues of the government of Guam; and

"Whereas, the Guam Legislature, because of the nature of the so-called Section 30 and Section 31 funds Guam receives under the Organic Act, and in view of the lack of any fees, lease or other rental payments from the federal government for the extensive military installations and facilities located on Guam, considers such Section 30 and Section 31 funds as payments in lieu of lease and rental fees and payment in lieu of taxes for goods and products sold in the base exchanges which otherwise are not sold in exchanges on military bases located in the continental United States and thus for the purposes and relative to the Inspector General clause of the Organic Act of Guam these funds cannot be considered as a form of federal funding in any manner or form; and

"Whereas, the consensus of the Guam Legislature is that the people of Guam and the government of Guam have, in fact, over the years since the ceding of Guam to the United States, since the signing of the Organic Act of Guam and since the enactment of the Elective Governor Act, learned and long practiced the precepts of good government and have proven their maturity, ability and readiness to use the electoral process to elect leaders of ability and integrity; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, that the people of Guam do hereby urge the Honorable Congressman Ben G. Blaz, duly elected by the people of Guam as Guam's Delegate to the U.S. House of Representatives, to immediately introduce legislation amending §9A of the Organic Act of Guam to:

"(a) Protect and preserve the sanctity and confidentiality of the tax records of the citizens of Guam by specifically prohibiting the Office of Inspector General from conducting audits on named tax returns;

"(b) Limit and restrict the jurisdiction and authority of the Office of the Inspector General to financial audits of those programs within the government of Guam which are federally funded in the form of direct grants, grants-in-aid or technical assistance funds;

"(c) Designate the Governor of Guam as the only official authorized to publicly release any information on the financial audits of those programs within the government of Guam which receive federal funding in the form of direct grants, grants-in-aid or technical assistance funds and to establish penalties for any violation thereof;

"(d) Prohibit financial or management audits by the Office of the Inspector General of any accounts of the government of Guam which are not in direct receipt of federal funds in the form of grants, grants-in-aid, or technical assistance grants; and

"(e) Authorize the Governor of Guam to refuse and prohibit the release of any information or documentation which, in his opinion, is not germane to financial and management audits of the accounts of the government of Guam which are in direct receipt of federal funds in the form of grants, grants-in-aid, or technical assistance grants, unless so ordered by a court of competent jurisdiction; and be it further

"*Resolved*, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the Honorable Ben G. Blaz, Delegate of the people of Guam to the U.S. House of Representatives; to the Honorable George H. Bush, President of the United States; to the Honorable Daniel Quayle, Vice President of the United States; to the Director of the office of Inspector General of the Department of the Interior; to the Honorable Manuel U. Lujan, Secretary of the Interior; to the Honorable Stella Guerra, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Territorial and International Affairs; to the Honorable J. Bennett Johnston, Chairman, Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources; to the Honorable George Miller, Chairman of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; to the Honorable Ron de Lugo, Chairman, House Subcommittee on Insular Affairs; and to the Honorable Joseph F. Ada, Governor of Guam."

POM-271. A resolution adopted by the Pacific Basin Development Council; relative to the authority of the Inspector General of the Department of the Interior in matters dealing with Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

POM-272. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

"No. 85

"Whereas, for the People of Puerto Rico to exercise their right to self-determination, it is necessary to clearly establish the democratic rights that shall rule this process.

"Whereas, this legislature studied, examined and considered Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 and House Concurrent Resolution 54, for the purpose of authorizing a referendum to amend the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to incorporate the democratic rights of the People of Puerto Rico, referred to in the second Section of this Act, which shall rule any consultation to change our political status.

"Whereas, although the majority of the members of both Houses of the Legislature supported said Concurrent Resolutions, they could not be approved because they lacked the endorsement of two thirds of the members of each Legislative Chamber required by the Constitution.

"Whereas, this Legislature solemnly recognizes the basic postulate of democracy that the fundamental matters which define the political future or a society must be ratified by the direct vote of the people.

"Whereas, it is convenient to separate these matters from the discussion in the general election.

"Whereas, it is necessary for the People of Puerto Rico to have a vehicle through which they can express to the Government of Puerto Rico their desire to consecrate these democratic rights in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and to petition the Government of the United States for the democratic rights that shall rule any consultation on our political future.

"*Be it enacted by the Legislature of Puerto Rico:*

"Section 1.—This Act shall be known and may be cited as the "Guarantee of Democratic Rights Act".

"Section 2.—It is provided that the following Claim for Democratic Rights be submitted to the people of Puerto Rico for their approval:

"We, the people of Puerto Rico, solemnly claim that the following democratic rights be guaranteed in our Constitution:

"the inalienable right to determine our political status, freely and democratically

"the right to choose a status of full political dignity without colonial or territorial subordination to the plenary powers of the Congress

"the right to vote for the three status alternatives Commonwealth, Statehood and Independence, based on the sovereignty of the People of Puerto Rico

"the right that the winning alternative in a status consultation shall require more than half the votes that are cast

"the right that any consultation on status shall guarantee, under any alternative, our culture, language and identity, which includes our international sports representation

"the right that any consultation on status shall guarantee, under any alternative, the American-citizenship safeguarded by the Constitution of the United States of America."

"Section 3.—The Guarantee of Democratic Rights Act expresses the feeling of the Legislature of Puerto Rico. The Claim for Democratic Rights contained herein constitutes a claim to the Government of Puerto Rico on the desirability to consecrate them in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and a Petition to the Congress and to the President of the United States for these rights to be respected when acting on our political status. If it is approved by the people, the Claim for Democratic Rights may only be modified or revoked through consultation with the people and it shall not be affected by the results of the general election.

"Section 4.—The Claim for Democratic Rights provided by Section 2 of this Act, shall be submitted for approval to the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in a referendum to be held on December 8, 1991. The ballot shall state that this claim constitutes a petition to the Congress and to the President of the United States.

"Section 5.—The Commonwealth and Statehood alternatives included in the Claim for Democratic Rights which shall be submitted to the people on December 8, 1991, are forms of status of permanent union with the United States.

"The Claim for Democratic Rights is not a claim for a change of status. The result of the referendum shall not be interpreted to be in favor or against any status alternative or political party. Neither shall it be interpreted as a petition for separation, nor modification of the present status, nor of the use of the two flags, two anthems and two languages as provided in our legal system.

"Section 6.—The Secretary of State shall remit a certified copy of this Act and its English language translation to the President of the United States and to all the members of the Congress of the United States.

"Section 7.—The Secretary of State shall remit a certified copy of the results of the referendum provided by Section 2 of this Act, to the Governor of Puerto Rico, to the President of the United States and to the members of the Congress of the United States.

"Section 8.—If any competent court declares any provision of this Act or any part thereof null, said declaration shall not affect the validity of the other provisions of this Act.

"Section 9.—This Act shall take effect immediately after its approval."

POM-273. A resolution adopted by the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources:

"No. 85

"Whereas, for the People of Puerto Rico to exercise their right to self-determination, it is necessary to clearly establish the democratic rights that shall rule this process.

"Whereas, this Legislature studied, examined and considered Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 and House Concurrent Resolution 54, for the purpose of authorizing a referendum to amend the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico to incorporate the democratic rights of the People of Puerto Rico, referred to in the second Section of this Act, which shall rule any consultation to change our political status.

"Whereas, although the majority of the members of both Houses of the Legislature supported said Concurrent Resolutions, they could not be approved because they lacked the endorsement of two thirds of the members of each Legislative Chamber required by the Constitution.

"Whereas, this Legislature solemnly recognizes the basic postulate of democracy that the fundamental matters which define the political future of a society must be ratified by the direct vote of the people.

"Whereas, it is convenient to separate these matters from the discussion in the general election.

"Whereas, it is necessary for the People of Puerto Rico to have a vehicle through which they can express to the Government of Puerto Rico their desire to consecrate these democratic rights in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and to petition the Government of the United States for the democratic rights that shall rule any consultation on our political future.

"*Be it enacted by the Legislature of Puerto Rico:*

"Section 1.—This Act shall be known and may be cited as the 'Guarantee of Democratic Rights Act.'

"Section 2.—It is provided that the following Claim for Democratic Rights be submitted to the people of Puerto Rico for their approval:

"We, the people of Puerto Rico, solemnly claim that the following democratic rights be guaranteed in our Constitution:

"the inalienable right to determine our political status, freely and democratically

"the right to choose a status of full political dignity without colonial or territorial subordination to the plenary powers of the Congress

"the right to vote for the three status alternatives Commonwealth, Statehood and Independence, based on the sovereignty of the People of Puerto Rico

"the right that the winning alternative in a status consultation shall require more than half the votes that are cast

"the right that any consultation on status shall guarantee, under any alternative, our culture, language and identity, which includes our international sports representation

"the right that any consultation on status shall guarantee, under any alternative, the American citizenship safeguarded by the Constitution of the United States of America."

"Section 3.—The Guarantee of Democratic Rights Act expresses the feeling of the Legislature of Puerto Rico. The Claim for Democratic Rights contained herein constitutes a claim to the Government of Puerto Rico on the desirability to consecrate them in the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and a Petition to the Congress and to the President of the United States for these rights to be respected when acting on our political status. If it is approved by the people, the Claim for Democratic Rights may only be modified or revoked through consultation with the people and it shall not be affected by the results of the general election.

"Section 4.—The Claim for Democratic Rights provided by Section 2 of this Act, shall be submitted for approval to the qualified electors of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in a referendum to be held on December 8, 1991. The ballot shall state that this claim constitutes a petition to the Congress and to the President of the United States.

"Section 5.—The Commonwealth and Statehood alternatives included in the Claim for Democratic Rights which shall be submitted to the people on December 8, 1991, are forms of status of permanent union with the United States.

"The Claim for Democratic Rights is not a claim for a change of status. The result of the referendum shall not be interpreted to be in favor or against any status alternative or political party. Neither shall it be interpreted as a petition for separation, nor modification of the present status, nor of the use of the two flags, two anthems and two languages as provided in our legal system.

"Section 6.—The Secretary of State shall remit a certified copy of this Act and its English language translation to the President of the United States and to all the members of the Congress of the United States.

"Section 7.—The Secretary of State shall remit a certified copy of the results of the referendum provided by Section 2 of this Act, to the Governor of Puerto Rico, to the President of the United States and to the members of the Congress of the United States.

"Section 8.—If any competent court declares any provision of this Act or any part thereof null, said declaration shall not affect the validity of the other provisions of this Act.

"Section 9.—This Act shall take effect immediately after its approval."

POM-274. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Wyoming, Michigan opposing the adoption of H.R. 2840, the Lead Contamination Control Act Amendments of 1991; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-275. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Wyoming, Michigan favoring the adoption of legislation to protect cities from superfund liability; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-276. A resolution adopted by the City Council of Wyoming, Michigan favoring the adoption of the Improved Bottled Water Act of 1991; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

POM-277. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 15

"Whereas, The President of the United States has proposed a surface transportation reauthorization bill, which calls for tolls on interstate highways and federal subsidies for private toll roads; and

"Whereas, The California Department of Transportation has suggested that toll roads built under the President's proposal be modeled after the four toll road projects authorized in California by Section 143 of the Streets and Highways Code; and

"Whereas, The department has also suggested that Congress authorize the use of federal funds for the four demonstration projects authorized by Section 143; and

"Whereas, The language of Section 143 and the legislative history of the bill that added that section clearly indicate that only private funds were to be used to build the demonstration projects; and

"Whereas, The private developers selected for those projects have been given contracts containing the following provisions:

"(1) Large "franchise zones" within which competing projects, including improvements to many public roads, are prohibited.

"(2) The right of the developer to lease miles of airspace along toll roads for a nominal fee, on which the developers can build gas stations, restaurants, shopping centers, and other buildings.

"(3) No limit on the amount of tolls that the developer can charge.

"(4) Developers are allowed profits in excess of 20 percent from the tolls.

"(5) No limit on the profits developers can realize from airspace revenues.

"(6) Developers, through the Department of Transportation, may condemn land for the projects; and

"Whereas, The Legislature of the State of California finds that it is inappropriate to provide federal subsidies to private toll road investors; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to retain the prohibition against the use of federal funds for toll roads, except for demonstration projects currently authorized by Congress, toll bridges, and toll roads financed with interest bearing loans, and not to enact any surface transportation reauthorization act that includes the imposition of tolls on interstate highways; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-278. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 22

"Whereas, California is experiencing steady growth in its incarcerated population; and

"Whereas, Pregnant women, women with children, and minors comprise a significant portion of the incarcerated population; and

"Whereas, Inmate health care costs are skyrocketing due to increased incidences of AIDS, substance abuse, and mental illness; and

"Whereas, In 1985, the federal government had a policy of providing medicaid for the first and last month of an inmate's incarceration; and

"Whereas, in 1985, the federal government reversed its policy and discontinued federal medicaid financial participation; and

"Whereas, Currently, otherwise eligible persons are denied medicaid eligibility upon entering a county detention or correctional facility; and

"Whereas, Counties must now fund inmate health care through county general fund moneys; and

"Whereas, These county general fund moneys could be used more effectively to provide other services, such as health care to the indigent; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation, or adopt regulations, approving medicaid eligibility for otherwise eligible inmates in a county-operated detention or correctional facility, or a county-operated juvenile facility; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Secretary of Health and Human Services."

POM-279. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 12

"Whereas, The Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-272) has been in effect for over a decade; and

"Whereas, The number of abused and neglected children being placed in out-of-home care for their protection is increasing; and

"Whereas, Existing family preservation programs initiated by California show great benefits and cost effectiveness; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature hereby respectfully requests the President and the Congress of the United States to do all of the following:

"(a) Review and update provisions of the federal Adoption Assistance and Child Welfare Act of 1980 (P.L. 96-272);

"(b) Support provisions that strengthen the ability of states to operate family preservation programs that result in a reduction of the need for out-of-home placements utilizing funding provided under Part E of Title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 670 et seq.) for the placement of children;

"(c) Support provisions that encourage the development of multifaceted, broad-based, family preservation programs combining features of juvenile justice, mental health, and social service programs;

"(d) Support provisions that provide for a 90 percent federal match under Part E of Title IV of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. Sec. 670 et seq.) for the planning, development, and installation of statewide automated child welfare data-processing systems;

(c) Support provisions that provide respite care for foster parents to assist them in meeting the needs of children who are victims of substance abuse or have special medical needs; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Governor, to the Secretary of the State Health and Welfare Agency, to the Secretary of Child Development and Education, to the Director of the State Department of Mental Health, to the Director of the State Department of Social Services, and to the Director of the Department of the Youth Authority."

POM-280. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 10

"Whereas, Abortion is a legal medical service related to pregnancy and the choice to elect an abortion is a personal, private right protected by the United States Constitution and California Constitution; and

"Whereas, The federal government provides assistance for pregnancy-related care for substantial numbers of women under a variety of federal programs, including the the medicaid program, the Indian Health Care Program, the Federal Employees' Health Benefits Program, the program of health care for military dependents and retirees, the Peace Corps program, general payments to the District of Columbia, and the program of medical services to federal penal and correctional institutions; and

"Whereas, Pregnant women who otherwise are provided pregnancy-related care under these programs have been denied equal access to health care services due to Congress' severe and unjustified restrictions on their freedom to choose services that relate to abortion; and

"Whereas, Denial of access to health care services because those services relate to abortion is unjust and unfair to pregnant women who are or whose spouses are employed by the federal government or who otherwise are dependent on the federal government for health care, and threatens their health and well-being and that of their families; and

"Whereas, Denial of abortion services to pregnant women who rely on the federal government for health care creates a two-tiered health care system where poor women are unable to afford a privately funded abortion and women with more resources are able to finance a private abortion; and

"Whereas, Medicaid recipients, Native American women, Peace Corps volunteers, federal employees and their dependents, military personnel and their dependents, and women in federal prisons are often unable to afford a privately funded abortion; and in the case of women in federal prisons, they are unable to leave prison to obtain abortion services; and

"Whereas, It is incumbent upon the Legislature of the State of California to request that Congress ensure that all women in our society have an equal opportunity to protect their reproductive health and to exercise their constitutional right to choose whether to terminate a pregnancy; and

"Whereas, There are two bills advancing in Congress that are each known as the Reproductive Health Equity Act, and that are designed to restore access to abortion services for women who are dependent on the federal government for their health care; and

"Whereas, The reproductive Health Equity Act would require the federal government to provide abortion services to women who receive Medicaid, Native American women, Peace Corps volunteers, federal employees and their dependents, military personnel and their dependents, and women in federal prisons; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to enact the Reproductive Health Equity Act to ensure that all women in our society have an equal opportunity to make reproductive health decisions; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of the resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-281. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 34

"Whereas, In California, between 1980 and 1991 the median sales price of a single-family home has escalated dramatically; and

"Whereas, In California, the percentage of people who can afford a first home has declined dramatically; and

"Whereas, In California, the average down payment for a home for a first-time buyer has significantly risen, presenting an insurmountable goal for many Californians; and

"Whereas, The dream of home ownership is fading for many Californians and others across the United States; and

"Whereas, The Legislature of the State of California and the United States Congress have shown the willingness and desire to help make home ownership attainable to those who seek to achieve it; and

"Whereas, A special type of savings account to encourage and assist individuals and families to accumulate funds for a down payment on the purchase of a first home, either in the form of an Individual Housing Account (IHA) or an existing Individual Retirement Account (IRA), which would provide either a federal tax deduction or credit for the amount deposited, with interest accumulating tax free, would greatly enhance the opportunity for greater home ownership; and

"Whereas, The law already permits a broad range of investment vehicles for IRA's and other similar accounts, and to most Americans, a house is their most significant, costly, and valuable investment; and

"Whereas, The Legislature of the State of California finds and declares that assisting those Californians who desire home ownership is both sensible and fair; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation that will provide tax incentives for individuals who save for a down payment on the purchase of a first home; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress create a new Individual Housing Account to allow individ-

uals to save funds for the purchase of a first home, the amounts deposited to be deductible, and the income therein to accumulate tax free; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress modify Individual Retirement Accounts to allow their funds to be used for a down payment on the purchase of a first home; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Congress enact these savings incentives for the benefit of low- and middle-income first-time home buyers, and not for purposes of home refinancing or for other purchases of residential real estate; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-282. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 4

"Whereas, California has been experiencing a brutal crisis in the access of indigent people to health care; and

"Whereas, Preventive prenatal health care programs have been proven to be overwhelmingly cost-effective; and

"Whereas, Low-income women often begin prenatal care late in their pregnancies or have too few visits, because of a lack of money, transportation, or child care, or because clinics are often not open at convenient times; and

"Whereas, At least one other state has addressed this problem by successfully implementing a prenatal health care program using mobile outreach units; and

"Whereas, At least one California hospital has proposed a similar program, which would utilize a mobile health van to provide prenatal care to the target population in an effective and efficient manner; and

"Whereas, Since patients reached by such a program are usually Medi-Cal eligible, it is necessary that the program be approved for federal medicaid reimbursement by the Health Care Financing Administration; and

"Whereas, Although the administration allows satellite clinics to be certified for medicaid reimbursement and although at least one mobile health care program has been approved for reimbursement, the federal government lacks clear statutory authority to certify those programs for medicaid reimbursement; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States to enact legislation or require the Health Care Financing Administration to adopt regulations permitting the certification of mobile prenatal health care van programs for reimbursement under the medicaid program; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Director of the Health Care Financing Administration, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-283. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Finance:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 9

"Whereas, When the United States Congress amended the Social Security Act in 1972 to increase retirement benefits to reflect cost-of-living increases, a technical flaw in the amended benefit formula overcompensated people who retired after 1972; and

"Whereas, Congress corrected its error by amending the Social Security Act in 1977 to bring benefits back to historical levels and phased in the reduction over five years, affecting individuals born between 1917 and 1926, the so-called "notch" years; and

"Whereas, The phase-in period has not provided a smooth transition, but has resulted in "notch babies" receiving as much as $3,000 per year less in benefits than people who have similar work histories but were born in 1916; and

"Whereas, Members of Congress have for several years tried to pass legislation that would establish a uniform benefit formula to treat those born in the "notch" years equitably; and

"Whereas, The Legislature of the State of California feels that the continued inequities in benefits received by persons born during the "notch" years undermines public confidence in the social security system and, consequently, affirms its commitment to the equitable distribution of social security benefits; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact appropriate legislation which would prospectively correct the "notch" in social security benefit payments for persons born between 1917 and 1926; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairpersons of the House and Senate Committees on Aging, and to each Senator and Representative from California, in the Congress of the United States."

POM-284. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Finance:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 98

"Whereas, The Federal Government has mandated that the states provide health care for the poor; and

"Whereas, The Pennsylvania Medicaid system meets that mandate by providing health care to the State's poor; and

"Whereas, The Medicaid program includes ever-growing numbers of eligibles and benefits which are mandated by the Federal Government; and

"Whereas, Those Federal mandates are driving up the costs of the Medicaid program, causing costs to the states to triple in the last ten years; and

"Whereas, Pennsylvania has utilized a Federally-allowable "pooling" mechanism to match the Federal contribution toward the costs of Medicaid; and

"Whereas, The Federal Health Care Finance Agency is proposing to prohibit states from engaging in "pooling"; and

"Whereas, The elimination of "pooling" has the potential for costing Pennsylvania one billion dollars over the next three years; and

"Whereas, Pennsylvanians cannot afford the rate of taxation which would be required to supplant that one billion dollars loss; therefore be it

"*Resolved (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the Congress of the United States to reject these proposed rules of the Health Care Finance Administration; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of each house of Congress and to each member of Congress from Pennsylvania."

POM-285. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 29

"Whereas, The people of the Soviet Union have finally thrown off the yoke of totalitarianism after a failed Communist coup; and

"Whereas, Boris Yeltsin, the first democratically elected leader, was instrumental in turning back the forces of totalitarianism and in rejecting Communism in the Russian Republic; and

"Whereas, This is the 23rd anniversary of the Prague Spring in which the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact countries invaded Czechoslovakia in order to crush the liberalization drive of Alexander Dubcek; and

"Whereas, The Warsaw Pact no longer exists—the Eastern Block countries of Czechoslovakia, Poland, and East Germany have gained freedom from the tyranny of the Soviet system; and

"Whereas, The Republic of Armenia struggles to rid itself of the oppressive antifree market domination of the Soviet Union; and

"Whereas, The Republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania have declared themselves independent and are represented by democratically elected presidents; and

"Whereas, The United States of America has never recognized Stalin's forcible incorporation of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania into the Soviet Union; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That it is the sense of the California State Legislature that the United States should recognize Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania as free and independent states, and support the other republics, such as Armenia, who are struggling to achieve freedom, self-government, and autonomy; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, and to the Governor of California."

POM-286. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 47

"Whereas, The United States has never acknowledged the incorporation of the Baltic republics into the Soviet Union due to the illegal nature of the Molotov-Ribbentrop agreement of August 23, 1939, and the subsequent hostile acquisition of land thereof: and

"Whereas, The peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia have individually, and collectively, resisted the Communist domination of their homelands in the name of independence and democracy throughout 52 years of Soviet rule; and

"Whereas, These republics have maintained their own individual religions, languages, traditions, and literature throughout the Soviet occupation; and

"Whereas, These republics opposed the illegal coup attempt against Mikhail Gorbachev in August of 1991; and

"Whereas, These republics have been longtime supporters of democracy and independence; and

"Whereas, These nations have declared independence from the Soviet Union; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California supports Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in their struggle for independence from the Soviet occupation, and that the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and Congress of the United States of America to act immediately to extend full diplomatic recognition to the freely elected Baltic governments of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-287. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 19

"Whereas, Seven soldiers of the Israel Defense Forces have been missing in action for several years in Lebanon: Yehuda Katz, Zechariah Baumel, and Tevi Feldman have been missing since 1982; Samir Assad has been missing since 1983; and Ron Arad, Yosef Pink, and Rachamim Levi-Alsheech have been missing since 1986; and

"Whereas, All evidence points to their being held in territory controlled by the Syrians by organizations linked with Syria and Iran; and

"Whereas, These Israeli POW's are being held incommunicado, and are deprived of all basic rights, such as contacts with their families and meetings with the International Red Cross—and this treatment constitutes a blatant violation of the Geneva Convention and a cruel disregard for the ordeal of their families and loved ones; and

"Whereas, Syria, Iran, and the organizations holding the Israeli POW's have refused to acknowledge responsibility for the fate of the POW's and have further refused to divulge any information as to the location or welfare of these individuals; and

"Whereas, POW's are now being exchanged following the Persian Gulf War, and it is important that the Israeli POW's not be forgotten; and

"Whereas, Discussions have resumed regarding the exchange of prisoners and western hostages; and

"Whereas, Recent developments indicate that the region is moving toward peace talks on the Israeli-Arab conflict; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California hereby urges the United States Department of State to seek the cooperation of Syria and Iran in compelling the organizations holding the seven Israeli POW's referred to in this resolution to do both of the following as a first step towards a prisoner exchange in the very near future:

(1) To grant immediate access to the seven Israeli POW's to the International Red Cross.

(2) To provide the seven Israeli POW's with all conditions required by the Geneva Convention; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature also urges the Department of State to work with other western nations, and with middle eastern nations desirous of stability in the region, to support all efforts to secure the rights of the seven Israeli POW's referred to in this resolution—efforts which should include a full disclosure of all information relating to their welfare and to the conditions of their imprisonment and the ultimate release of the Israeli POW's as part of a general prisoner exchange; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President, the Vice President, and the Secretary of State of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-288. A concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 218

"Whereas, The Legislature of the state of Louisiana, acting with the best intentions, has previously made application to the Congress of the United States of America for the calling of a constitutional convention for the limited purpose of proposing certain amendments to the Constitution of the United States of America; and

"Whereas, The best legal minds in the nation today are in general agreement that a convention, notwithstanding whatever limitation might be placed upon it by the call of said convention, would have within the scope of its authority the complete redrafting of the Constitution of the United States of America, thereby creating a great danger of the well-established rights of our people and to the constitutional principles under which we are presently governed; and

"Whereas, The Constitution of the United States of America, while it has been amended many times in the history of the nation and may yet be amended many times, has been extensively interpreted and has proven to be a basically sound document which protects the freedom of all Americans; and

"Whereas, There is no need for a new constitution, the adoption of which would create legal chaos in America and only begin the process of another two centuries of litigation over its interpretation by the courts; and

"Whereas, Such changes as may be needed in the present Constitution of the United States may be proposed and enacted by the well-established methods of amendment contained therein.

"Therefore, be it *Resolved* That the Legislature of Louisiana does hereby rescind any and all previous applications to the Congress of the United States made by the Legislature of the state of Louisiana pursuant to Article V of the Constitution of the United States of America for the calling of a constitutional convention for any purpose, limited or general.

"Be it further *Resolved*, That a copy of this Resolution be transmitted to the presiding officers of the Senate and the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States of America, to the members of the Louisiana delegation to the Congress of the United States, and to the presiding officers of each house of the legislatures of the several states."

POM-289. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 28

"Whereas, The Congress of the United States adopted the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986 (IRCA) to legalize millions of individuals who were residing permanently or temporarily in the United States without proper documentation; and

"Whereas, The act permitted the states to create and maintain education, health, and public assistance programs to assist individuals who were eligible for amnesty to transfer from undocumented to documented status; and

"Whereas, Congress appropriated $4 billion to fund the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants (SLIAG) program to assist states in the creation and maintenance of these programs; and

"Whereas, Approximately 1.6 million immigrants currently reside in California, have applied for amnesty, and will become permanent residents of California; and

"Whereas, Approximately 75 percent of the 1.6 million amnesty applicants are functionally illiterate in English, having scored below the 215 level on the Comprehensive Adult Student Assessment System which is equivalent to a fifth grade level and is the literacy benchmark used by California's welfare reform program to indicate a student's readiness for preemployment training; and

"Whereas, The newly legalized population has a health profile which includes a high incidence of diabetes, hypertension, upper respiratory problems, at risk pregnancies, high rates of pregnancies, and other conditions which lead to life-threatening illnesses; and

"Whereas, The federal government through the Family Support Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services issued the SLIAG regulations more than eight months after the program was to have begun; and

"Whereas, This delay was compounded by a lack of guidelines to be followed by states and their subcontractors in dealing with proper documentation and cost tracking standards; and

"Whereas, The initial SLIAG federal regulations precluded states from spending SLIAG funds on outreach programs, and this resulted in much lower amnesty applicant participation in SLIAG programs; and

"Whereas, The amnesty applicant population is difficult to reach through traditional outreach programs and for this reason specially tailored programs had to be created to encourage this population to access SLIAG programs; and

"Whereas, The federal government issued regulations which permitted state governments to expend their SLIAG funds through 1994 and the State of California chose to use SLIAG funds over a minimum period of five years; and

"Whereas, The use of SLIAG funded programs has increased every year they have been in existence, and the total demand for these programs is expected to remain at a high level; and

"Whereas, Despite all these obstacles, California has drawn more than $962 million, or 75 percent, of its approximate $1.3 billion allocation, to date, in SLIAG funding and expects an upward trend in future expenditures; and

"Whereas, The level of spending of SLIAG funds has resulted in the impression that the newly legalized population is not in need of education, health, and public assistance services; and

"Whereas, This impression contradicts the experience in California where the newly legalized population is in great need of services to assist in its integration into the mainstream of society; and

"Whereas, The General Accounting Office recommended concurrence with congres-

sional action to restore SLIAG funds for 1992 if states could demonstrate increased use of SLIAG moneys; and

"Whereas, The President has proposed to eliminate the allocation of $1.1 billion to the states for the SLIAG program, as proposed in the Federal Fiscal 1992 Budget; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to honor the commitment to restore previously deferred federal funding for the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grants program and to assist the amnesty population in the transition into the mainstream of American society; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California further memorializes Congress that the State of California approved and adopted a five-year program for spending its full SLIAG funding, and must accommodate 1.6 million, or more than 50 percent of the total amnesty population in the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of Education, the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and each Senator and Representative from California to the Congress of the United States."

POM-290. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 40

"Whereas, the antiprogesterone steroid mifepristone, known as RU-486, has been approved and available in France since November of 1988; and

"Whereas, It is in keeping with basic medical standards to avoid surgical procedures whenever an equally effective noninvasive alternative is available; and

"Whereas, The medical community has identified RU-486 as a promising treatment for medical purposes, including the termination of early pregnancy, treatment of breast and brain cancer, endometriosis, AIDS, glaucoma, gynecological malignancies, osteoporosis, Cushing's disease, and other serious conditions facing women and all Americans; and

"Whereas, The American Medical Association, the American Public Health Association, the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, the American Association for the Advancement of Science, the California Medical Association, the California Chapter of the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, Los Angeles Medical Commission, and the California Conference of Local Health Officers have formally recognized the importance of RU-486 and support the testing of RU-486 in the United States; and

"Whereas, The Food and Drug Administration acted precipitously and without evidence that RU-486 was brought into the country illegally when it enacted the import alert against RU-486, and this import alert has thwarted the availability of RU-486 to the few scientific research studies being conducted in the United States with the drug; and

"Whereas, California is the largest state in the nation and should maximize its resources to help make this technology available to women; and

"Whereas, All American women and their families are entitled to the best medical research and this drug may be the solution to many conditions now predominantly affecting women; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California memorializes the Congress and the President of the United States to rescind the import alert imposed by the Food and Drug Administration and support the use of RU-486 for all appropriate research and, if indicated, clinical trials; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California urges the State Department of Health Services to use its statutory authority to approve the use of RU-486 in clinical trials as expeditiously as possible; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California encourages all qualified investigators, companies, and businesses which decide to test RU-486 to choose California as the site for clinical trials for all research associated with RU-486 and to submit the data from the clinical trials to the Food and Drug Administration and the State Department of Health Services; and be it further

"*Resolved* That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the manufacturer of RU-486, Roussel UCLAF, 35 Boulevard des Invalides 75007, Paris France, to the Commissioner of the federal Food and Drug Administration, and to the State Director of Health Services."

POM-291. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 42

Whereas, Every American woman should consider herself at risk of breast cancer; and

"Whereas, Breast cancer remains the most common form of cancer in women, and ranks second only to lung cancer as the leading cause of cancer deaths among women; and

"Whereas, Breast cancer robs women of their security, their dignity, and valuable years of motherhood to the children they leave behind; and

"Whereas, 175,000 women were diagnosed with breast cancer in 1990 and 44,500 women will die from breast cancer this year; and

"Whereas, There is recognition and significant alarm over new statistical data indicating that breast cancer in the United States is rising at a rate of approximately 2 percent a year; and

"Whereas, While 30 years ago, breast cancer struck one in every 20 American women, today one out of nine American women will develop breast cancer in her lifetime; and

"Whereas, Of those women who contract breast cancer, one out of four will die from the disease, and this death rate represents a 24 percent increase since 1979; and

"Whereas, The annual direct medical costs of breast cancer to our society are $2 billion, more than $2,000 a year per woman living with breast cancer; and

"Whereas, The direct and indirect costs concerning a breast cancer diagnosis exact an economic toll of $8 billion a year. This figure is computed by the impact on the health system, the loss of work time, the loss of women employees, and the lives lost to a disease that bankrupts families emotionally and economically; and

"Whereas, Current breast cancer research is directed at detection and treatment, but basic research to prevent healthy women from ever getting breast cancer is virtually nonexistent; and

"Whereas, The total budget for the National Cancer Institute (NCI) has increased by only $23 million in inflation-adjusted dollars during the last decade, the lowest percentage increase among all the institutes of health; and

"Whereas, Due to the lack of funds, only 26 percent of the NCI breast cancer grant requests approved through the peer review process currently receive any money; and

"Whereas, The continuing rise in the lifetime risk of breast cancer incidence means that emphasis must be given to breast cancer when research grants are funded; and

"Whereas, The only effective means of protecting the health of American women is to conduct the critically needed basic breast cancer research as proposed on the federal level; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes Congress and the President of the United States to enact HR 2210, the Breast Cancer Basic Research Act, by Representative Mary Rose Oakar, which would allocate $50 million to the National Cancer Institute for breast cancer research; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-292. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

"ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 37

"Whereas, The practice of replacing striking workers has increased dramatically since 1981; and

"Whereas, The right of workers to withhold their labor during negotiations has been an essential element of the collective bargaining process; and

"Whereas, Employee faith in the collective bargaining process is damaged by any undermining of this basic right, thereby increasing the probability of prolonged and disruptive labor disputes and increased economic hardship; and

"Whereas, An increasing number of employers in the 1980's relied upon a 1938 Supreme Court ruling that legalized the "replacement" of striking workers and a 1986 decision that authorized preferential treatment for strikebreakers, thereby disturbing the balance of power which had previously ensured fair and expedient labor negotiations; and

"Whereas, Thousands of workers in California have lost their jobs when they chose to exercise their rights and, in effect, their last practical recourse under the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act; and

"Whereas, Proposed amendments to the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act contained in H.R. 5 and S. 55 would make it unlawful to offer permanent employment or employment preference to an individual who would work during a strike; and

"Whereas, Approval of H.R. 5 and S. 55 would restore the right to strike to its historical status as a legitimate tool of the collective bargaining process; and

"Whereas, H.R. 5 and S. 55 would further prohibit employers from providing preferential benefits to workers who would cross the picket line to return to work and thus protect the rights of, and prevent retribution against, workers who participate in job actions; and

"Whereas, H.R. 5 and S. 55 are essential to restoring the integrity and purpose of the National Labor Relations Act's and the Railway Labor Act's time-tested process for the fair and equitable disposition of labor disputes; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to amend the National Labor Relations Act and the Railway Labor Act to prevent discrimination based on participation in labor disputes by limiting the hiring of permanent replacement workers during bona fide labor-management disputes and prohibiting employers from offering preferential benefits to those workers; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

POM-293. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 27

"Whereas, Family planning clinics provide important access to health services for California's economically disadvantaged women; and

"Whereas, Federal Title X funds provide $12.2 million to California, financial assistance critical to over 200 family planning facilities statewide; and

"Whereas, The majority of women served by family planning clinics receiving Title X funding have no other alternatives for health care; and

"Whereas, California's family planning clinics are already experiencing significant financial stress as the result of below average reimbursement rates for services provided; and

"Whereas, California's law on "informed consent" requires physicians to advise their patients of all risks, benefits, and alternatives on any medical procedure, and any limits on informed consent would represent a violation of California law; and

"Whereas, California's physicians have a professional obligation to inform their patients of all their treatment alternatives, and any limits on this obligation would jeopardize the patient-physician relationship; and

"Whereas, The United States Supreme Court ruling of May 23, 1991, in the case of Rust v. Sullivan, upholds regulations adopted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services which prohibit family planning programs that receive Title X funds from providing abortion counseling or referral services to women; and

"Whereas, The people of California believe that the regulations adopted by the Secretary of Health and Human Services violate the fundamental rights to privacy and free speech, despite the United States Supreme Court's holding; and

"Whereas, Family planning providers might be forced out of moral obligation, the exercise of their right to free speech, and their adherence to California's law on informed consent, to turn down federal title X funding, thereby reducing the number of women served or closing family planning facilities; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California expresses its deep concern over the United States Supreme Court ruling in the case of Rust v. Sullivan upholding the regulations prohibiting health care professionals from counseling their patients on, or providing referrals for, abortion, and strongly supports federal legislation clarifying original congressional intent that Title X funding be used to provide unbiased and accurate information on reproductive health care for economically disadvantaged women; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California strongly urges that the United States Congress enact clarifying legislation and the President of the United States sign the legislation into law; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California registers its alarm that the United States Supreme Court ruling undermines a woman's fundamental right to privacy, including her right to choose an abortion, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California reaffirms its support for protection of these rights for all women, including economically disadvantaged women, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature of the State of California expresses its serious concern that the United States Supreme Court ruling limits the First Amendment rights of free speech of health care professionals, and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the President pro Tempore of the United States Senate, to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States, to the Chief Clerk of the United States House of Representatives, to the Secretary of the United States Senate, and to the presiding officer of each house of the legislature of each of the other states in the Union."

POM-294. A joint resolution adopted by the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Human Resources:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 25

"Whereas, It is the intent of the Legislature to support and enhance the opportunity and ability of all persons with disabilities who reside within California to lead productive, independent, personally empowered, and contributing lives; and

"Whereas, The Department of Rehabilitation provides a specialized constellation of case management, counseling, and the purchase of goods and services and provides a variety of assistance to persons with disabilities who have independent living, employment, and employability needs; and

"Whereas, This vocational rehabilitation system was originated and defined in 1920 by federal law whose current form and funding is embodied in the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the intent of which is to promote more independent and productive lives for persons with disabilities; and

"Whereas, Efforts to review and reform this original purpose have only led to minor changes in the service approach, philosophy, and funding patterns, despite evidence which indicates not only that persons with severe disabilities continue to experience 74 to 86 percent unemployment, major underemployment due to segregation and low expectation, and increasing waiting lists for services, but also that disabled youth and older persons are extremely underserved; and

"Whereas, With passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, which sets forth a sweeping new and systematic declaration of human and civil rights for people with disabilities based on contemporary congressional findings and the assertion of cultural and societal values, dramatic increases in full participation and economic integration of all persons with disabilities will occur in America; and

"Whereas, No substantial effort has been exerted to look at the many areas of potential system improvements and economies that coexist between the public rehabilitation system, unemployment insurance, and workers' compensation in California that would lead to major benefits to the California economy; and

"Whereas, A revolution in technology, science, and support services exists that offers to expand the benefits to consumers of services and the public and private employer sector in California; and

"Whereas, Research from the last decade and the summing up of the best clinical and program practices has not been applied to the service delivery system in order to improve quality and economies to the consumer and tax paying public; and

"Whereas, The federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 will be reauthorized by Congress by September 1991; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California, jointly*, That the Legislature of the State of California urges the California Congressional Delegation to support a two-year reauthorization process of the federal Rehabilitation Act of 1973 that will provide widespread local hearings to ensure maximum public input to focus on establishing a paradigm shift in the rehabilitation system service design in keeping with the spirit and letter of the Americans with Disabilities Act; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Legislature commission a study to be completed not later than September 1, 1993, and to be coordinated by the Senate Office of Research in consultation with the Department of Rehabilitation, which parallels the congressional reauthorization timetable that will provide the Legislature with recommendations on the administrative, programmatic and fiscal reorganization of the Department of Rehabilitation that will do all of the following:

"(a) Research and analyze cost-benefit data that currently exists.

"(b) Define performance standards and outcome measures for services to persons with disabilities.

"(c) Compare state-of-the-art service models and approaches to maximize the benefits and utilization of these best practices in serving people with disabilities.

"(d) Recommend appropriate levels of funding needed to meet the needs of disabled persons in service modes that are congruent with the modern mission of the department.

"(e) Install patterns of spending and utilization of federal funds that promote maximum success in achieving personal empowerment and productive independent living, including voucher systems and the creative mixing and matching of public and private funds.

"(f) Install service models that maximize economies consistent with the values, goals, and objectives of career-oriented support

services and assessment approaches; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Senate transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

Mr. LOTT:

S. 2163. A bill to establish a Second National Blue Ribbon Commission to Eliminate Waste in Government; to the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Governmental Affairs, jointly, pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, with instructions that if one Committee reports, the other Committee have thirty days to report or be discharged.

Mr. SARBANES:

S. 2164. A bill to increase the number of weeks for which benefits are payable under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BINGAMAN:

S. 2165. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (40 U.S.C. 471 et seq.) to establish the National Education Property Board, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Mr. KASTEN:

S.J. Res. 243. A joint resolution to designate the period commencing March 8, 1992 and ending on March 14, 1992, as "Deaf Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

Mr. GORE:

S. Con. Res. 87. A concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should lead the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Environment and Development; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. SARBANES:

S. 2164. A bill to increase the number of weeks for which benefits are payable under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS

• Mr. SARBANES. Mr. President, economic circumstances have made it necessary to seek another extension of unemployment benefits for American workers. The legislation I am introducing today addresses a serious and urgent problem that Congress and the President should resolve as soon as possible.

The bill would provide an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits for jobless workers in all States through June 13, 1992. With this bill and the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Program enacted in November, workers could be eligible for up to 59 weeks of benefits in high unemployment States or 52 weeks of benefits in all other States.

Over a million jobless workers were able to claim extended benefits under the EUC program that went into effect in November. More than half of them will run out of benefits again in February. Unless we act, they will have the safety net pulled out from under them in the midst of a prolonged recession.

To get the economy out of recession and put it on course for strong economic growth in the future, we need a comprehensive economy recovery and growth program. One of the basic elements of the package must be a further extension of unemployment insurance benefits.

Unemployment insurance is the first line of defense against recession. Benefits paid to workers accomplish two objectives. First, they help workers and their families in a period of distress. Second, they help slow the deterioration of the economy. They flow to the locations in the most economic distress, and they are spent immediately. Unemployment benefits are a well-timed, well-targeted countercyclical economic stabilizer.

Unfortunately, today's recession has overrun the first line of defense. The recession is in its 18th month—three times as long as the basic benefit period. The is no evidence that we are turning the corner, in fact, some key economic indicators are worse today than at any other time during the recession. In December, the unemployment rate was 7.1 percent. Nearly 9 million Americans are unemployed and many of them have exhausted their unemployment benefits. They are looking for work in a job market that is far worse than it was when they lost their jobs.

During the recession, the number of long-term unemployed has risen sharply. Eighteen months ago, about 600,000 people had been without work for longer than 26 weeks. By December, more than 1½ million people had been looking for work for more than 26 weeks. The number took a sharp rise just within the last 2 months.

Given the direction of the economy and the growing numbers of long-term unemployed, it makes sense to extend the number of weeks of unemployment insurance coverage. In the last two serious recessions, workers who remained unemployed for extended periods of time received a minimum of 52 weeks of unemployment benefits. Today in the midst of the longest recession in postwar history, we provide only a maximum of 39 weeks of benefits.

The bill I am introducing today adds another level of benefits to the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act, which provides 13 or 20 weeks of benefits beyond the 26 weeks normally provided by State unemployment programs. The legislation would provide up to an additional 13 weeks in all States, through June 14, 1992. It also extends the authorization of the EUC program from June 13, 1992, through October 3, 1992.

In addition, the bill assures that the extended benefits trust fund will receive credit for the funding measures enacted as part of the EUC. Currently, the EB trust fund is being docked for the EUC benefits paid, but the fund is not being credited with the offsetting funding measures enacted in November.

I argued last year for an emergency declaration on the grounds that the funds had already been raised for the purpose of extended UI benefits. Instead of declaring an emergency, we enacted offsetting funding measures. The value of those measures should be credited to the trust fund.

The President's refusal to accept the unemployment bill Congress sent to him in August and again in October caused irreversible pain for countless numbers of families across the country. While they waited for an extension of benefits to take effect, many of them lost homes, were evicted from their apartments, had their cars reclaimed, and sank deeper in economic distress. This must not happen again. While the extension of unemployment benefits is a critical part of any economic package, it is a self-standing piece. It should be moved as quickly as possible and not embroiled in any other issues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2164

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

SECTION 1. INCREASE IN AMOUNT OF EMERGENCY UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.

(a) INCREASE IN BENEFITS.—

(1) Subparagraph (A) of section 102(b)(2) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-164, as amended) is amended to read as follows:

"(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this paragraph—

"(i) IN GENERAL.—

"(I) In the case of weeks beginning during a high unemployment period, the applicable limit is 33.

"(II) In the case of weeks not beginning in a high unemployment period, the applicable limit is 26.

"(ii) REDUCTION FOR WEEKS AFTER JUNE 13, 1992.—In the case of weeks beginning after June 13, 1992—

"(I) clause (i) of this subparagraph shall be applied by substituting '20' for '33', and by substituting '13' for '26', and

"(II) subparagraph (A) of paragraph (1) shall be applied by substituting '100 percent' for '130 percent'.

In the case of an individual who is receiving emergency unemployment compensation for a week which includes June 13, 1992, the preceding sentence shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of emergency unemployment compensation payable to such individual for any week thereafter beginning in a period of consecutive weeks for each of which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this Act."

(2) Subparagraph (A) of section 102(b)(1) of such Act is amended by striking "100 percent" and inserting "130 percent".

(3) Subsection (c) of section 501 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking "65" and inserting "130", and

(B) by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Effective on and after June 13, 1992, the preceding sentence shall be applied by substituting '65' for '130'; except that, in the case of an individual who is receiving extended benefits under this section for June 12, 1992, this sentence shall not apply for purposes of determining the amount of extended benefits payable to such individual for any day thereafter in a continuous period for which the individual meets the eligibility requirements of this section and the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act."

(b) TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Subsection (e) of section 101 of such Act is amended by striking "in a 20-week period or 13-week period, as defined in section 102,".

(2) Subsection (c) of section 102 of such Act is amended—

(A) by striking "20-week" in paragraph (1) and inserting "high unemployment", and

(B) by striking "20-WEEK" in the subsection heading and inserting "HIGH UNEMPLOYMENT".

(3) Section 102 of such Act is amended by striking subsection (d).

(4) Subsection (e) of section 102 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(e) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) MINIMUM DURATION.—A high unemployment period shall last for not less than 13 weeks.

"(2) NOTIFICATION BY SECRETARY.—When a determination has been made that a high unemployment period is beginning or ending with respect to a State, the Secretary shall cause notice of such determination to be published in the Federal Register."

(5) Paragraph (1) of section 102(g) of such Act is amended by striking "20-week period or 13-week period" and inserting "high unemployment period".

(6) Paragraph (2) of section 102(g) of such Act is amended by striking "20-week period" and inserting "high unemployment period".

(7) Section 106(b) of such Act is amended by striking "paragraph (3), (4), or (5)" and inserting "paragraph (3) or (4)".

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall apply to weeks of unemployment beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—The amendment made by subsection (b)(7) shall take effect as if included in the amendments made by section 3 of the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the termination of the application of title IV of the Trade Act of 1974 to Czechoslovakia and Hungary" (Public Law 102-182).

SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAM.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Sections 102(f)(1)(B), 102(f)(2), 106(a)(2), and 501(b) (1) and (2) of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991 (Public Law 102-164, as amended) are each amended by striking "June 13, 1992" and inserting "October 3, 1992".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (a) of section 501 of such Act is amended by striking "June, 1992" and inserting "September 1992".

SEC. 3. TRANSFER OF FUNDS TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND.

The Secretary of the Treasury shall transfer to the extended unemployment compensation account (as established by section 905 of the Social Security Act) of the Unemployment Trust Fund an amount equal to the amount of deficit reduction resulting from the provisions contained in title IV and title VI of the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991. The amount of such deficit reduction shall be based on estimates made by the Office of Management and Budget pursuant to the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 for the 5-fiscal year period beginning in fiscal year 1992. In the event no official estimate is required for any year in such 5-year period, the Office of Management and Budget shall make such estimates for such a year in a manner consistent with the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990.

SEC. 4. TREATMENT UNDER PAY-AS-YOU-GO PROCEDURES.

(a) DESIGNATION AS EMERGENCY.—The provisions of (and amendments made by) this Act shall be treated as provisions designated as emergency requirements by the President and the Congress under section 252(a) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(b) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY, ETC. NOT CONSIDERED.—Any amount of new budget authority or outlays resulting from the provisions of (and amendments made by) this Act shall not be considered for any purpose under the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.●

By Mr. KASTEN:

S.J. Res. 243. Joint resolution to designate the period commencing March 8, 1992, and ending on March 14, 1992, as "Deaf Awareness Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DEAF AWARENESS WEEK

● Mr. KASTEN. Mr. President, the voice of students at Gallaudet University was heard loud and clear in March 1988. Their victorious progressive social movement stands alone in the history of deaf America. As the fourth anniversary of these events nears, it is important that we commemorate that most important accomplishment—the installation of Gallaudet's first ever deaf president.

Today it is a great joy for me to once again introduce a resolution that provides national recognition to the historic "Deaf Awareness Week."

Designating March 8-14, 1992, as "Deaf Awareness Week" will not only educate able American citizens, but it will also bring enormous pride to the approximately 24 million who are hearing impaired. This week will symbolize ideals that have been realized over the past 4 years.

This special week will once again provide us with the opportunity to listen to our fellow citizens who are hearing impaired.

Let us continue to pay tribute to the outstanding efforts of the students, faculty, and alumni of Gallaudet University by commemorating "Deaf Awareness Week."●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 2

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2, a bill to promote the achievement of national education goals, to establish a National Council on Educational Goals and an Academic Report Card to measure progress on the goals, and to promote literacy in the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 21

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] was added as a cosponsor of S. 21, a bill to provide for the protection of the public lands in the California desert.

S. 152

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 152, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the personal exemption to $4,000.

S. 308

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the name of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. KERREY] was added as a cosponsor of S. 308, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permanently extend the low-income housing credit.

S. 642

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 642, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the personal exemption for dependents of a taxpayer.

S. 643

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 643, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the personal exemption for dependent children of a taxpayer who are 6 years old or younger.

S. 644

At the request of Mr. SIMON, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 644, a bill to amend the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 to allow offsetting transfers among discretionary spending categories.

S. 701

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr.

MACK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 701, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the exemption for dependent children under age 18 to $3,500, and for other purposes.

S. 752

At the request of Mr. SMITH, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 752, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make the allocation of research and experimental expenditures permanent.

S. 1009

At the request of Mr. COATS, the name of the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1009, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of the exemption for dependent children under age 18 to $4,000, and for other purposes.

S. 1257

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1257, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of certain real estate activities under the limitations on losses from passive activities.

S. 1725

At the request of Mr. DIXON, the name of the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1725, a bill to authorize the minting and issuance of coins in commemoration of the quincentenary of the first voyage to the New World by Christopher Columbus and to establish the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Scholarship Foundation and an Endowment Fund, and for related purposes.

S. 1774

At the request of Mr. BRYAN, the names of the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. BURNS] were added as cosponsors of S. 1774, a bill to establish a silver congressional commemorative medal for members of the United States Armed Forces who served in a combat zone in connection with the Persian Gulf conflict.

S. 1931

At the request of Mr. STEVENS, the names of the Senator from Texas [Mr. BENTSEN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. LUGAR], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. DECONCINI] were added as cosponsors of S. 1931, a bill to authorize the Air Force Association to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs.

S. 1966

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BROWN] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1966, a bill to establish a national background check procedure to ensure that persons working as child care providers do not have a criminal history of child abuse, to initiate the reporting of all State and Federal child abuse crimes, to establish minimum guidelines for States to follow in conducting background checks and provide protection from inaccurate information for persons subjected to background checks, and for other purposes.

S. 2009

At the request of Mr. PACKWOOD, the name of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2009, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify certain provisions relating to the treatment of forestry activities.

S. 2065

At the request of Mr. DIXON, the names of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] and the Senator from New York [Mr. D'AMATO] were added as cosponsors of S. 2065, a bill to federalize the crime of child molestation for repeat offenders.

S. 2106

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DURENBERGER] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2106, a bill to grant a Federal charter to the Fleet Reserve Association.

S. 2157

At the request of Mr. CRANSTON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD] was added as a cosponsor of S. 2157, a bill to limit the provision of United States foreign assistance, including security assistance, to developing countries whose military expenditures do not exceed more than 3.6 percent of their gross national product.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 214

At the request of Mr. RIEGLE, the names of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. EXON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SIMON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. SASSER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. JEFFORDS], the Senator from Kansas [Mrs. KASSEBAUM], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. COATS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DANFORTH], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. DOMENICI], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 214, a joint resolution to designate May 16, 1992, as "National Awareness Week for Life-Saving Techniques."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 228

At the request of Mr. D'AMATO, the name of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. CONRAD] was added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 228, a joint resolution to designate the week beginning February 23, 1992, as "National Manufacturing Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 240

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the names of the Senator from New York [Mr. MOYNIHAN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. GLENN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BRADLEY], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KERRY], the Senator from Maryland [Ms. MIKULSKI], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. LIEBERMAN], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. METZENBAUM], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BIDEN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. REID], the Senator from Florida [Mr. GRAHAM], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. WOFFORD], the Senator from Washington [Mr. ADAMS], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRYAN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. RIEGLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. ROTH], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. RUDMAN], the Senator from Utah [Mr. GARN], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GRASSLEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. MACK], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. PRESSLER], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. MURKOWSKI] were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 240, a joint resolution designating March 25, 1992 as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy."

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 17

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BUMPERS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHAFEE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SHELBY], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN], and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. HELMS] were added as cosponsors of Senate Concurrent Resolution 17, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to certain regulations of the Occupational Safety and Health Administration.

AMENDMENT NO. 1479

At the request of Mr. NICKLES the name of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. BOND] was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 1479 proposed to S. 2, a bill to promote the achievement of national education goals, to establish a National Council on Educational Goals and an Academic Report Card to measure progress on the goals, and to promote literacy in the United States, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 87—RELATIVE TO THE PRESIDENT'S ATTENDANCE AT THE EARTH CONFERENCE

Mr. GORE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

S. CON. RES. 87

Whereas the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development presents an unique opportunity for community of nations to discuss options to arrest poverty and environmental destruction as we enter the 21st century;

Whereas, the United Nations has determined that the conference will be a meeting at the head of State and Governmental level: Now, therefore be it;

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that the President should—

(1) attend the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in June, 1992, as the leader of the United States delegation.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I rise on this occasion to introduce a joint resolution calling upon the President of the United States to recognize the extraordinary importance of the U.N. Conference on Environment and Development that will be held in Brazil in June of this year, and to announce his intention to personally attend the so-called Earth summit.

Mr. President, I feel that President Bush should attend the Earth summit because it promises to be the single most important meeting ever held on the global environmental crisis and on ways that nations throughout our world can work together to successfully resolve this crisis.

The leaders of every other G–7 nation have already announced their intention to personally attend the Earth summit. I believe it is time for President Bush to do the same thing.

Mr. President, I want to emphasize that in introducing this resolution, I am not in any way, shape, or form attempting to make a partisan point. In fact, today in the other body, this same resolution is being introduced by my colleague, Congressman JOHN PORTER, a member of the Republican Party, and it has very strong bipartisan support, both in the Senate and in the other body.

Our purpose in introducing this resolution is, first of all, to urge the President to go to the Earth summit. But there is a second message in this resolution. We want to provide some degree of comfort to the President's political advisors by telling them that they do not have to worry about President Bush receiving any partisan criticism for leaving this country and going to Brazil for this extremely important meeting.

On some occasions during the past year, there has been a good deal of criticism directed at President Bush for paying less attention to the problems of our country than he has devoted to the many challenges that fall into his area of responsibility where foreign policy is concerned, and Congressman PORTER and I, and many of our colleagues in both parties, want to put the Congress of the United States on record as urging the President to attend the Earth Summit, partly to insulate him from any concern about criticism if he does attend.

I think he has to attend, Mr. President. Let me simply say that it is inconceivable to me that he would decide not to go to the Earth summit. There has been a very long planning period in nations throughout the world aimed at the Earth summit in Brazil. There are two important negotiations underway right now, one on climate change, and the other on biodiversity, aimed at completing treaties that will be signed at the Earth summit in Brazil.

A few weeks ago, Mr. President, I spent a week in Geneva at the negotiations leading up to the UNCED conference in Brazil. I wish to report to my colleagues that the negotiations are proceeding fairly well, although I must say that on some key points, the lineup is 139 countries on one side, and only one country on the other side; that one country being our own, because of positions adopted by the Bush administration.

I will go into more detail on those points in a formal report to the Senate on the preparations for UNCED and on the state of play in the negotiations for the climate change treaty and the biodiversity treaty. But on this occasion, I want to focus on this resolution.

I intend, incidentally, Mr. President, to seek a vote on this resolution even if it has to be offered as an amendment to some pending measure, because I think it is extremely important to get a vote. My colleague, Congressman PORTER, is also announcing his intention today to do everything possible to get a vote in the other body, as well.

The fact is the continued vitality of the Earth's life-support assistance and critical decisions that will affect the health and well-being of our citizens and the people around the world are in the balance, and it is critical Democrats and Republicans join together to ensure the success of the Earth summit. The President's commitment to this objective is, of course, imperative.

We are the natural leaders of the world in the United States of America. I do not mean for that to sound as a chauvinistic remark. I think it is simply a fact. The United States must lead and, within the United States, the President must lead.

I also want to point out that Congressman PORTER and I are not alone in sending this message to the President. In fact, we are merely amplifying the voices of many thousands of people around the country and around the world who have been making the same urgent request of Mr. Bush.

I even took the occasion, Mr. President, to privately advise President Bush's political campaign officials that if he does not attend, he is likely to suffer political embarrassment at a key moment. The California primary will take place right in the middle of the Earth summit. But it will not be just President Bush who suffers embarrassment; our country will suffer embarrassment. I just want to get this message across. It is imperative for him to be there, and many, many thousands of people are saying the same thing to him.

In fact, just yesterday, children from all parts of our Nation came to Washington to express their deep concern for the health of this planet, and they brought petitions with them. They are collecting a million signatures from children between now and Earth Day in April to convince President Bush to attend the Earth summit and to go there with a meaningful position.

These children tried their best to deliver the message to President Bush, but they were turned away at the White House. One of them said she understood fully, this 7-year-old girl who was just very cute, very precious. She said she understood he had an important speech on Tuesday night, and he probably had to memorize it.

In any event, the petitions will be delivered. Senator CHAFEE and I held a hearing yesterday at which the children presented their petitions and their CO_2 challenge, and we promised to make certain that the petitions would get to President Bush. These children delivered a simple and powerful message. The future of their planet and their own futures are in jeopardy, and we must do all that we can to stop the devastation and destruction now.

In addition to the urging of these children, we have heard a similar message time and again from Mr. Major, the leader of the United Kingdom; Mr. KOHL, the leader of Germany; the leaders of all nations in the European Community and the Scandinavian countries; and Japan.

All have urged President Bush to join with them and attend the Earth summit and work with them rather than work against the effort to successfully resolve the global environmental crisis.

We need action now to control our emissions of greenhouse gases. Scientists tell us that the threat to the planet's delicate climate balance builds as 1991 was the second hottest year in history in spite of the volcanic eruption at Mount Pinatubo, second to 1990 in breaking all the temperature records.

We need action now to stop the senseless destruction of forests, especially rain forests, throughout the year. That process of destruction is increasing and, in the process, thousands of species are lost forever, at a rate

1,000 times faster than at any point in the last 65 million years.

We need, Mr. President, to accelerate the phaseout of ozone-depleting chemicals. In fact, present law requires President Bush to accelerate the phaseout schedule whenever new significant evidence is brought forward about the destruction underway.

Within the past year we have had two significant reports. First, we found out that the process was occurring 200 percent faster than previously thought. Second, we now have evidence of ozone depletion in the summertime in northern latitudes.

For a long time, scientists have warned us of the possibility that the buildup of these ozone-depleting chemicals throughout the atmosphere of the entire Earth poses the threat of ozone depletion above populated areas. Now it is taking place in winter to a small degree, as much as 18-percent less ozone in the stratosphere above Washington, DC; in Colorado, New Hampshire, Tennessee, and other States represented in the Chamber here at this moment, and the threat of even worse damage lies ahead.

We have a right to expect President Bush to comply with the law, which does not give him the choice. It says he has to accelerate the phaseout. When is he going to act? When is the EPA going to act?

Mr. President, again this is only one of the steps which needs to be taken to protect the Earth's environment, and on this occasion I am concentrating on this resolution to urge the President to attend the Earth summit in Brazil. This resolution will come up for a vote very soon, one way or another. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

In closing, President Bush is, in my opinion, guilty of the greatest abdication of leadership and abdication of responsibility by refusing to give this environmental crisis his attention. I hope my colleagues will join me in calling for the leadership we need from President Bush now and will support this resolution.

I thank the Chair.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

NATIONAL LITERACY ACT

METZENBAUM AMENDMENT NO. 1496

Mr. METZENBAUM proposed an amendment to the bill (S. 2) to promote the achievement of national education goals, to establish a National Council on Education Goals and an Academic Report Card to measure progress on the goals, and to promote literacy in the United States, and for other purposes, as follows:

At the appropriate place add the following new section:

SEC. . GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORT ON THE EFFECT OF TAX INCENTIVES ON LOCAL PUBLIC SCHOOL FINANCE.

(A) Within 180 days after the date of enactment, the Comptroller General of the United States shall prepare and submit to the chairman and ranking majority member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources a study on the nature and extent of tax abatements given by state and local governments to attract business and the extent to which such abatements:

(i) reduce the tax base available to support public elementary and secondary education in the jurisdiction granting the abatement;

(ii) reduce the funds available to support elementary and secondary schools in the jurisdiction granting the abatement; and

(iii) review the extent to which citizens in the state and local community granting the abatement realize the potential impact of the abatement on funding for local public schools.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SUBCOMMITTEE ON COURTS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Courts and Administrative Practice of the Committee on the Judiciary, be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, January 28, 1992, at 2:30 p.m., to hold a hearing on H.R. 2450, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for Federal jurisdiction of certain multiparty, multiforum, civil actions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING, AND URBAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, Tuesday, January 28, 1992, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing on the nominations of Daniel F. Evans, Jr., Lawrence U. Costiglio, William C. Perkins, and Marilyn R. Seymann to be Directors of the Federal Housing Finance Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

VIEWS ON REPATRIATION IN NICARAGUA

• Mr. REID. Mr. President, Mike O'Callaghan, former Governor of the State of Nevada, and now executive editor of the Las Vegas Sun, recently returned to Nicaragua where he has traveled several times before. His insight into the repatriation process of former Contras is very revealing, and I ask that a series of three articles he wrote upon his most recent return be printed in full in the RECORD.

The articles follow:

[From the Las Vegas Sun, Dec. 21, 1991]

BITTERSWEET RETURN TO NICARAGUA

(By Mike O'Callaghan)

JUIGALPA, NICARAGUA.—Returning to this area, where I arrived with three busloads of wounded Contras after the peace agreement last year, is both rewarding and depressing. It reminds me of eating bittersweet chocolate, each bite brings a new taste sensation.

Nicaragua Army-supported death squads, recompas, roam the hills north and east of Managua. They boldly strike in broad daylight with the knowledge that the national police and Sandinista-run army will not pursue or punish them. More about this bitter side of Nicaragua tomorrow.

The progress that many amputees and other wounded members of the Nicaraguan Resistance have made is the sweet side of what has happened during 1991.

The Organization of American States Commission, under the direction of Santiago Murray, working with the Nicaraguan Repatriation Institute, headed by Oscar Soyalbarro, who is better known as Commandante "Ruben" by his Contra followers, has made great progress.

I found my friend Jehu, still confined to a wheelchair, sitting in from of his own little home instead of the tent I left him in last year. Certainly his concrete house with three small rooms wouldn't pass other sanitary or engineering standards in our city. Nevertheless, his pride in having a home showed in his voice and eyes. He wanted me to tell Lus Vegan Dr. Lonnie Hammargren hello and reassure him he will soon be walking. Lonnie checked Jehu when he was hospitalized in Honduras before the ceasefire.

Amputees Cecillo Centeno ("Alex") and Jose Gregorlo Amnador ("Coyote") are two of three partners running a tiny store on the backside of this town. But a stone's throw away from them is amputee Luis Felipe Granados ("Punche") along with three partners operating a shoe-mendling shop. A neighboring carpenter shop is run by Ellos Miranda who is still recuperating from serious war wounds.

Fifteen miles off the main road between this town and Managua is a newly founded farming community of 28 wounded Contra combatants and their families. Just down the rutted dirt road from this group of 160 people is a larger, more prosperous Sandinistan-run cooperative. "We get along with them just fine," one of the men told me.

Serglo O'Connor and Carlos Garcia, who we still call "Chino," had taken me to see the new community. The homes with dirt floors are shelters the occupants treasure. Chino, a leg amputee who heads up the wounded veterans of the Resistance Forces, gave me added hope when saying, "We have talked to the Sandinista wounded and soon we will have a gathering." These men and women are tired of war and bloodshed.

Closer to Managua, near the town of Tipitapa, I watched former Contra combatants harvest a bumper crop of millet. Despite the drought, the hybrid seed brought in from Texas produced a crop beyond all expectations. Standing in the fields ready for harvest is a heavy sesame crop. The several dozen people involved in farming almost 2,000 acres will pay for the seed, all the expenses and still have enough to feed their families during the coming year.

Over on the Atlantic Coast, 20 fishing boats have been acquired by Santiago Murray and the OAS for the Miskito Indian fish-

ermen who had their boats and homes destroyed during the reign of Daniel Ortega and his Sandinista government.

Yes, I found progress and hope among the returnees who have acquired land and have been involved in social and economic programs. The sad part of what I observed is the large number—about half—of the returning combatants are yet to receive land or adequate program help. An equal percentage of the widows and orphans left behind by their dead comrades also are waiting for their meager $20 monthly pensions while the Sandinista survivors have been receiving checks for more than a year.

I'll stop writing before moving into the bitter side of 1991 Nicaragua. The fruit and vegetable stands along the rural roads and in the city of Managua markets are weighted down with delicious produce. There is some economic progress and the streets and roads are crowded with vehicles and people. But the blood and terror of war haven't disappeared, and for some Nicaraguans it has increased.

[From the Las Vegas Sun, Dec. 22, 1991]

WHERE I STAND

(By Mike O'Callaghan)

LA TRINIDAD, NICARAGUA.—"We have more being killed in that area than we did during the war," Julio Escovio Moreno told me from his wheelchair. Julio, now a patient in the nearby Adventist Hospital, went on to say that the Sandinistas couldn't find him to shoot during the war "but now they have done it during peace."

They are the Nicaraguan Army death squads called recompas who have killed almost 200 returning Contra commanders and cadre during the past year. Lately they have included any person who had been resistance-oriented during the most recent war.

Julio knows the four militia men, from a Sandinista cooperative near Quilati in northern Nicaragua, who shot him three months ago. He has little hope that they will be punished although a Sandinista army captain took his statement several days after the attack.

Inside the hospital, I found a former resistance soldier who had been seriously wounded five days earlier when army-uniformed recompas stopped a civilian bus in which he was riding. Only he and two other former resistance men, who they killed immediately, were marked for death by the terrorists.

In a nearby bed was a rural policeman, also a former Contra, who, along with three other policemen, was ambushed by the recompas. He was first taken to the village of Wiwill, where infection set in after three days. Then he was taken to a large state hospital in Managua where the Sandinista doctors ignored him for another three days. He was infected enough for his leg to be amputated when his friends had him transferred up north to this hospital, where former Contra doctors have been fighting to save the limb.

Several times, wounded and sick members of the Nicaraguan resistance have related their bad and/or inadequate care by state-paid doctors. Too many cases have been documented for these charges to be ignored. It's difficult for me to even imagine this is a common happening, but I now have no doubts that many recent amputations and deaths are the result of Sandinista government doctors intentionally ignoring the combat returnees.

David Lopez, a physical therapist, told me, "I still am fearful after what happened November 26th." Lopez, a Chilean volunteer for the Pan American Development Foundation, was talking about the day recompas and several other uniformed soldiers took disabled resistance veteran Mario Vivas from a hospital transportation vehicle and killed him. Lopez tried to intervene, but one of the terrorists stuck an AK-47 automatic rifle in his belly and took off the safety.

Are David Lopez, and his beautiful wife going to leave Nicaragua? No, like several outsiders trying to heal the wounds of war, he intends to remain and hopes to complete his mission. But like most people working in this area, he has found the national police and the army a greater hindrance than help.

President Violeta Barrios de Chamorro's 1990 landslide election victory over then-ruling Sandinista strongman Daniel Ortega has been a short-lived win for her supporters. Soon after her win at the polls, she retained her son-in-law Antonio Lacayo as her top minister. Lacayo's close relationship with Sandinista Minister of Defense Gen. Umberto Ortega, Daniel's brother, resulted in his retention as general of the army. Also the national police remained in the control of the Sandinista party which had been rejected by the voters. Ruling musclo remains in the hands of the losers, to be abused 12 months later.

As a former member of the Carter Commission who closely watched the entire election and campaign, I have been shocked to see what has happened to the farmers and peasants who fought for their freedom from the Sandinista tyranny. Since that election, I have returned to help the amputees and war orphans, and participated in the peace negotiations between the Yatama (Indian) resistance forces and the government. A sweet election victory has been allowed to deteriorate into a reign of terror for many of the most helpless and needy returning veterans.

Last Sunday at Catholic Mass, I heard Cardinal Obando Bravo tell us that he would like to believe that the radio commentator was incorrect when calling Nicaragua "a nation of murderers."

Following Mass, I went to the office of the Nicaraguan Repatriation Institute in Managua and saw bullet holes in the building and a limb blown off of a tree in the yard by a rocket-propelled grenade. This didn't happen during the war but on November 8th, when the Sandinista mobs burned city hall, trashed a monument, destroyed an Organization of American States vehicles and burned several municipal vehicles.

Judging by what is happening in Nicaragua today, that radio commentator appears to be more right than wrong. This isn't an accurate view of the people of this nation. In reality, it is the Nicaraguan people who are the victims of the few who refuse to give up power they legally lost during the 1990 election.

The time is here for responsible U.S. leaders to tell Violeta, Umborto, his brother Daniel, and Antonio Lacayo that enough is enough. Army death squads in El Salvador couldn't be tolerated by this nation and neither can they be tolerated when being allowed and even supported by a government we recognize and have supported since the 1990 election.

Very simply, they must be told to knock it off or no more dollars from Uncle Sam. We must refuse to be in bed with a government that not only allows terrorism but also supports it.

[From the Las Vegas Sun, Dec. 25, 1991]

CHRISTMAS COMES TO NEEDY ORPHANAGE

(By Mike O'Callaghan)

SAN ISIDRO LIBERTADOR ORPHANAGE.—Here, on top of a hill, there are dozens of orphans who are having a happy Christmas because of some generous Las Vegans, I won't mention names, because the largest contributor wishes to remain anonymous.

During our visit last week, Christmas came to this orphanage and three others founded by the late Padre Rafael Maria Fubretto Michelli, who came to Nicaragua from Italy four decades ago.

Padre Fubretto's orphanages here and in northern rural areas house 160 children. Never have I seen such poverty in an institution where a child having his or her own bed feels blessed. Thanks to our friend Chino, Tim Brown, a senior State Department officer on leave, and I found our way from downtown Managua up a dirt trail to San Isidro Libertador.

We first entered a bare dining room where the cook, with two small babies, was waiting to hear what food would be available for the evening meal. Would it be rice and beans or would it be beans and rice? Just by chance that evening it would be beans with some beef ribs for flavor. It wasn't the night for milk which can only be afforded once a week.

Then we wandered through the old box-shaped huts that allow the wind, rain and sunlight to enter between gaps in the siding. Soon we found a German volunteer, Anje Christine Pape, a registered nurse. For weeks, she has been seeking financial support so the children could have something special for Christmas.

"What if you had enough money to buy things for the children. What would you buy?" I asked her. She paused momentarily and answered, "Food, wood to cook it with and toys." She quickly explained that even the diet of beans and rice requires firewood to cook it. We handed the wide-eyed young lady the money she needed.

The volunteer from Germany, called Anna by the children, then told us she would take the money and make certain that all 160 children in the four orphanages would have a variety of food, goodies and toys Christmas week. We didn't tell her that an even larger sum of money from the Silver State would be left with David Lindwell at the U.S. Embassy to set up provisions for additional food and milk during the coming months.

There are several concrete platforms where some of the box-shaped shelters had rested. What happened to them, did they just fall apart? No, they were blown away during several storms that have struck the hilltop.

Inside one hut, two girls were sleeping with all of their personal belongings resting at the foot of their beds. Both Maria Anna Cooper, 10, and Blanca Rosa Megilla, 14, informed me that they would, like most of the children, be here on Christmas day. Next door in a similar hut, several children gathered around their only television set and one child played with a small scooter, the only toy in sight.

Our next stop was at an empty chapel where benches are moved in from a classroom when services are held. During our visit, it was obvious that simple items like chairs, towels and lockers are all in the category of luxuries unavailable to the children.

Well, thanks to some Las Vegans, all of these children will have a special day and week to remember when their friend Anna passes out gifts before they enjoy the best meal of the entire year.

Thanks to these Las Vegans and my new friend Anna, my day here at home will also be more enjoyable.•

ANNOUNCING THE WINNERS OF THE "HEALTHY ME, HEALTHY MAINE" CONTEST

• Mr. COHEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to have this opportunity to congratulate the winners of the "Healthy Me, Healthy Maine" contest.

Last fall, my office sponsored a contest designed to encourage children in Maine to recognize the importance of good health, nutrition, and physical fitness. The response to the "Healthy Me, Healthy Maine" contest yielded over 2,700 creative poems, essays, and posters. Schoolchildren in grades K to 8 throughout the State of Maine participated in the contest, enthusiastically demonstrating their appreciation of healthy habits.

These young artists and writers have shown an impressive understanding of the elements of good health and the need to ensure a healthy environment for themselves, their peers, and for future generations. As third grader Jana Savage of Bangor writes, "If you keep healthy, your life will be longer and more enjoyable. Being healthy means having a healthy body, healthy mind, and healthy attitude."

Studies show that emphasizing health promotion and prevention strategies can reduce the risk of health problems that result from unhealthy behaviors, such as smoking, excessive use of alcohol, or improper eating habits. I believe we would all do well to heed these children's messages in our own lives.

I would also like to thank the judges of the "Healthy Me, Healthy Maine" contest: Ruth Sargent, a resident of Peaks Island, ME, who writes and illustrates children's books; Dale Duff, sportscaster for WLBZ-TV in Bangor; and Ed Miller, executive director of the Maine Lung Association in Augusta. These people have generously lent their time and talent to the difficult task of choosing the best entries in each category.

Finally, and most importantly, it is my pleasure to honor and congratulate the following young people for their winning entries in the "Healthy Me, Healthy Maine" contest.

In the poem category for the K to 2 division, first place was awarded to Andrew Jameson of Warren Primary School. Angie Hafford of Allagash Consolidated School was recognized as the second place winner, and was followed by Jennifer Hafford and Jodi Kelly, also from Allagash Consolidated, who tied for third place. Adam Sokoloski of the Lewis Libby School in Milford received an honorable mention for his poem.

Flora Brown of Chebeague Island School placed first in the grades 3 to 5 division for her poem about good eating habits. Also in this division, Jay Lester of the Frank I. Brown School placed second; Jonathan Schaming of the Presumpscot School in Portland placed third, and Robert McCollom of Chebeague Island School received an honorable mention.

Jaime Nye of Corinna Junior High School was awarded first place for her verse in the poetry category for grades 6 to 8. Suzanne Delafontaine, a student at Noble Junior High in Berwick, placed second in this division. Mandy Damon of Jay Junior High School won third place for her entry, and Jeffrey Harding of Emerson Junior High School in Bar Harbor tied with Kelly Prince of John R. Graham School in Veazie for honorable mention.

In the essay category for grades 3 to 5, Melissa Jo Fraser, a student at the Helen Hunt School in Old Town, won first place for her essay on physical fitness. Jana Savage, a third grader at Bangor's Vine Street School, was awarded second place honors; and Sarah Cotter Egerhei of Rangeley Lakes Regional School won third place. Honorable mention went to Elizabeth Owen of Prescott Memorial School in Washington.

Eighth grader Christopher Maguire of Sanford Junior High School won first place in the essay division for grades 6 to 8 for his prose about the role of protecting the environment in the promotion of good health. Andrea D'Auteuil of the Gray-New Gloucester School received second place recognition for her essay. Third place went to Geoff Halber, a student at the John R. Graham School in Veazie. Honorable mention was shared by Joelle Smith, a seventh grader at Jay Junior High School, and Melissa Stillberger, a seventh grader at Noble Junior High School.

Once again, I want to thank the judges, parents, teachers, and all of the young people who participated for their enthusiasm and creativity. The winning posters in all grade divisions are on display this week in the rotunda of the Russell Senate Office Building, and I hope that my colleagues will take advantage of this opportunity to view these children's efforts.•

SANGER HIGH SCHOOL NJROTC

• Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce into the record an article about the Sanger High School Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps [NJROTC] which appeared in the November 1991 issue of Officer Review. This institution has been a constant source of pride for the City of Sanger, CA.

The NJROTC has dedicated itself to providing students with an alternative to drugs, violence, and crime. By placing a high value on education, discipline, citizenship, and community involvement, the NJROTC plays a substantial role in training the leaders of tomorrow.

Indeed, the wide variety of academic programs offered by the NJROTC has enticed more than 13 percent of the Sanger High student body to join the program. Their pursuit of excellence has resulted in the appointment of 23 students to our Nation's military academies. In 1985, eight students were appointed to the Naval Academy, an accomplishment that was acknowledged by President Ronald Reagan in a letter of congratulations to the unit. In addition, 32 of Sanger's cadets have received ROTC scholarships, while a number of graduating seniors have enlisted in the Armed Forces.

As a result of the commitment of individuals such as John Nicholson, a retired Navy captain and the commander of the unit, today's youth have the opportunity to improve themselves through the challenges posed by the Sanger program.

It gives me great pleasure to draw the attention of Senate to the accomplishments of the Sanger High NJROTC Program and I ask that a copy of the article from Officer Review appear in full at this place in the RECORD.

The article follows:

FRESNO CHAPTER MOWW SUPPORTS A HIGHLY SUCCESSFUL PROGRAM—HIGH ON NJROTC

(By JOC Dale Gamble)

High school students in California's San Joaquin Valley are receiving high tech academic instruction from a most unusual source—NJROTC. Students at Sanger High School do not regard the Naval Junior Reserve Officer Training Corps unit as a place to go just to march in formation with a rifle burying itself into their shoulders. Instead, they see this program as an avenue to the future. They have heard about record-setting appointments to the military academies, the numerous scholarships available through the program, and the credit given by graduating seniors who said how much their lives and changed because of NJROTC. They are enthusiastic about participating in the computer-oriented course with links of the Dow Jones, National Geographic Society, and even a direct communication line to NASA. Throughout the valley, students realize that this NJROTC unit is on the leading edge of technology and education, a combination which not only benefits them, but the Navy, as well.

Since 1976, Sanger High School's NJROTC cadets have gained enormous community and financial support. During this time, 13 percent of the total student population has enrolled in the unit, 23 have gone to one of the military academies (eight in one year to the U.S. Naval Academy), 32 of Sanger's cadets received ROTC scholarships to further their education, and a substantial number of graduating seniors enlisted in the armed forces. Over a four-year peak enrollment period between 1982 and 1986, 148 cadets left Sanger with either appointments or scholarships, or had enlisted. Fifty of the 148 joined the Navy.

The unit's most successful year was 1985. Referred to as "The Year of the Eight," six men and one woman obtained appointments to the U.S. Naval Academy, with yet another graduate headed for the academy's preparatory school. While other units have sent larger numbers, none have sent so many from the same high school. Each NJROTC unit can make only three nominations and

not all get appointments. However, all three of Sanger's nominees achieved direct appointments that year. Four more were appointed by U.S. Representatives. This record-setting achievement was recognized by former President Ronald Reagan in a letter to the unit congratulating them for such an accomplishment by a single high school.

That now-famous year for Sanger also had an impact on later generations of cadets. Arturo Ybarra, a senior heading for the Naval Academy's prep school, and Midshipman Kevin Delano both acknowledge that when they heard about the eight seniors leaving for the academy, they knew the program was important to their future. Delano remembers being in eighth grade at the time, and convincing his parents not to move from Sanger because he wanted to be part of the NJROTC. Ybarra was in the seventh grade in 1985, and he, too, recalls how those eight seniors changed his direction in life. In 10 months, he hopes to enter the Naval Academy for a career as a Marine Corps officer.

The main objectives of the NJROTC program are to teach leadership and citizenship, influence behavior, mold personal discipline, and produce productive individuals. The NJROTC program affords an opportunity for secondary school students to learn basic elements and requirements for national security and personal obligations as an American. While not specifically a recruiting method, an interest in the military as a possible career is often fostered.

Sanger, like other units, bases its curriculum on Naval Science textbooks. Inside their single-floor, three-room building, the staff of four retired naval members instruct cadets on topics such as: military orientation, U.S. history, geopolitics, science (oceanography, meteorology and astronomy), and military science.

What makes Sanger's NJROTC unit so consistently successful is its revolutionary educational concept, which has earned it several honor school awards. On a personal crusade over the past 15 years to graduate highly functional seniors into society, has been retired Navy CAPT John L. Nicholson. Both Sanger's Citizen and Educator of the Year recipient, Nicholson has redirected the curriculum to emphasize academics linked with computers and other modern technologies. Starting in 1976 with one computer, an antiquated typewriter with a broken space bar and sticking keys and an enrollment of 43 cadets, Nicholson has expanded to 35 computers and an enrollment which has gone as high as 305. This school year's enrollment was 246 of 1,609 Sanger students.

Nicholson was not satisfied with just military drilling. In 1986, he initiated the change to modern technology. "In eight weeks, the Navy can teach someone how to execute left face and right face commands, cut their hair, and say 'Yes, sir.' But our problem is that only one out of four seniors can pass the ASVAB to be gainfully employed by the military. To me, it was obvious what we had to do. We have to teach reading, writing, math and cultivate thinking skills in order for them to pass any kind of entrance exam. If we spend four years with a student in a glorified boot camp, then we aren't getting a fully qualified student, we aren't getting a talented student who is able to deal with the high-tech that's in our Navy."

Nicholson and his staff do not ignore the military requirements of the NJROTC program. He still enjoys getting out on the field with uniformed cadets with the shined shoes because he knows how much it improves their sense of belonging and self-esteem.

One man who never had any experience with the NJROTC program is Sanger High School principal, Ronald Schiller. One of his basic educational philosophies has always been to expect the best of any program. When eight students left Sanger for the Naval Academy the first year he was the principal, Schiller knew his campus has a tremendous program available to the students.

"Students go to Nicholson because he sells an academic product, and they see a future there," said Schiller. "As a by-product, the students also see other things the military teaches, such as discipline and leadership. Not only does this unit attract students who may be interested in a military career, it also attracts students who are bound for Stanford, the University of California, or Harvard."

One such cadet who earned many offers to colleges and universities was a young Hispanic daughter of migrant field workers. As Nicholson recalled, she applied herself totally to the program, excelled in academics and became the unit's commandant. Upon graduation, she opted to go to Harvard—without using an ROTC scholarship.

Interest in Sanger's NJROTC unit has spread throughout the San Joaquin Valley, as noticed by two NRD San Francisco recruiters. PNC Glenn Burghardt and HT1 William Zamora both have observed the unit's extraordinary stimulation on teenagers living in towns between Manteos and Bakersfield. Each has heard comments, such as, "N-J was the cool thing to do," and they have noticed the large number of transfer requests to Sanger.

"Throughout my 10 years of recruiting and association with ROTC, I have noticed a recurring theme on applicants' essays about the reason they are pursuing a commission as a naval officer," remarked Burghardt, the district's NROTC recruiter. "Each wrote about how much Nicholson had changed their life by emphasizing academics and proving that they had great potential and wouldn't have to accept anything less than success."

While assigned to NRS Fresno North, Zamora worked the high school for 18 months and knows how much everyone wants to attend college. Taking advantage of the unit's modern approach to education and the Navy's leadership in high technology, he was able to get closer to the students.

"NJROTC allowed me to spend less time convincing students about Navy opportunities. Sanger's kids are generally afraid to talk with recruiters because they believe that once they join, they will never return home. With this program, everyone in Sanger, including the students and their parents, has a chance to understand what the Navy is about before making a decision about joining."

Just like other NJROTC staffs, Nicholson knows he and his staff are analogous to recruiters because of their shared endeavors and positions in the classroom. Nicholson spent 26 years in naval aviation, concluding his career after serving as commanding officer of the USS *Ranger* (CV 61). Assisting the captain are: a lieutenant commander, a master chief petty officer, and a chief petty officer, all with 20 or more years of active duty experience.

"If you look at it from a recruiting point of view, explained Nicholson, "NJROTC is preparing young people to be better qualified for life, which will ultimately benefit the Navy. We are preparing these young people to go into whatever they want to go into, which includes the military. We don't ignore the military requirements, but we do push the academics because if students can't pass the ASVAB, or get high enough scores for electronics or nuclear power training, then we haven't done our job here."

Navy awareness through NJROTC is the biggest positive factor for a recruiter. Students have spent up to four years associating with the Navy, and have learned a lot about naval history, as well as adapting to the behaviors expected of military members. In Sanger's case, many of the students are in the top echelon of academic achievement, including valedictorians, and are extremely well-qualified for military service, because of the sophisticated method of instruction given by Nicholson and his staff. Many cadets attribute the program as the single most influential factor in their decision to pursue a military career. Nicholson advocates total interaction between units and recruiters, suggesting it should start either in the freshman year, or in the first year of enrollment in NJROTC. A recruiter could conceivably have three years to cultivate a rapport, and by graduation day, the students do not feel threatened and are more appreciative of career opportunities available in the Navy•

THE MONTREAL PROTOCOLS

• Mr. MACK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following article be printed in the RECORD.

This letter to the editor, written by then Secretary of Transportation Samuel Skinner, appeared in the November 25 edition of the Wall Street Journal. It is an excellent argument in favor of the Senate taking decisive action to approve the Montreal protocols:

SEEKING JUSTICE FOR KIN OF PAN AM 103 VICTIMS

Federal prosecutors have announced the indictment of two Libyan suspects in the bombing of Pan Am 103 in December 1988. Civilized people everywhere want the perpetrators of so unspeakably cruel and cowardly an act to be brought to justice, and soon.

Sadly, however, it will be a long time before the families of Pan Am 103 victims receive their own small measure of justice. Compensation that should be due them automatically as a result of an international air disaster will be paid only after years of grueling litigation, and then only if their lawyers are successful in proving Pan Am was somehow at fault in the Lockerbie tragedy. In a similar travesty, the families of the victims of the KAL 007 shoot-down have yet to receive a dime in compensation after eight years in the courts.

We need a better system—and it is available now, in two 16-year-old treaties called the Montreal Protocols. If ratified by the Senate, they would overhaul the hopelessly outdated rules on liability for international air accidents that were set in the 1929 Warsaw Convention, and provide a more humane response to those whose lives are shattered by such tragedies. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee has voted in favor of ratification four different times.

The main problem with the current rules is spelled out in the seldom-read fine print on every ticket: The airline's liability for injury or death is limited to a maximum of $75,000 per passenger.

The concept of limited liability was based on a simple trade-off. Recognizing how dif-

ficult it is to prove fault in an air tragedy, the world's airlines agreed to "strick liability"—automatic compensation of passengers or their estates, with a limit on the amount for the injury or death of any one passenger. And, the $75,000 limit applies only if the passenger was traveling to or from the U.S. For an American traveling from one foreign country to another, the maximum recovery is in the $10,000 to $20,000 range.

The Montreal Protocols would increase the liabilty of airlines everywhere to about $130,000 a passenger. More important, they would allow us to establish a "supplemental compensation plan" to ensure that U.S. citizens automatically get full compensation for all economic and noneconomic damages, and that they get it promptly. The artificial limits on recovery would be abolished, along with the all but insuperable burden of having to prove "willful misconduct" on the part of the airline.

The supplemental compensation plan would be established by the airlines and governed by Department of Transportation requirements. It would be funded by a modest surcharge—about $3—on every international ticket purchased in the U.S., but would provide benefits automatically in every case involving an American passenger, regardless of where the accident occurred, where the ticket was purchased or whether the surcharge was paid.

Unfortunately, the very trial lawyers who have made careers of litigating air-crash cases under the current, anachronistic system are opposing ratification of the Montreal Protocols. In fairness, it should be mentioned that the lawyers argue we should get rid of the Warsaw Convention altogether and just let them sue the airlines under the rules that cover most cases involving injury and wrongful death. Without the need to prove "willful misconduct" under the convention, they say, their batting average would soar.

I wish it were true. I've been a trial lawyer myself, and I don't like "strict liability" systems as a general rule. But our domestic legal system never has worked very well in international aviation cases, and it never will. In too many cases, U.S. courts would have trouble establishing jurisdiction, would have to apply the law of some other country, or would have great difficulty ascertaining the cause of an accident.

SAMUEL K. SKINNER,
Secretary of Transportation.

WASHINGTON.●

A BRIGHT IDEA FOR SAVING MONEY AND THE ENVIRONMENT

● Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I rise today to place in the RECORD an excellent editorial by the Cape Cod Times in Hyannis, MA. The Cape Cod Times has been a leading voice for environmental protection in Massachusetts and I think the following editorial makes a very simple but important point about how we can both save money as consumers and help the environment.

The editorial follows:

[From the Cape Cod Times, Dec. 22, 1991]

A BRIGHT IDEA FOR SAVING MONEY, THE ENVIRONMENT

Despite all our troubles with the economy and the environment, we Americans are virtually ignoring light-bulb technology that can help substantially with both.

The technology can enable us to reap the benefits of huge energy savings. It permits conservation without sacrifice.

And it's not a matter of switching off the lights. It's a matter of switching bulbs.

The compact, low-energy fluorescent lightbulb is the state of the art in lighting, and it is enormously more efficient than the conventional incandescent bulb. Fluorescent bulbs, which now can be used in conventional lamps, last about 10 times as long as incandescent bulbs and use some 70 to 80 percent less electricity. They are in widespread use in other countries, but not here.

Why aren't American factories making them—and why aren't American consumers demanding them?

Fluorescent bulbs are appreciably more expensive, but the long-term savings in electricity to the individual consumer is two to three times the price of the bulb.

Were we to act collectively in installing such bulbs, the savings in energy would be extraordinary. If all Americans switched overnight to energy-efficient bulbs, we could save three-quarters of all the energy that goes into lighting nationwide—without having to do with less light. This translates into a potential $25 billion annual saving. It also means we could, if we wished, close down every nuclear power plant in the country and some power plants operating on fossil fuels as well.

Many U.S. lightbulb manufacturers produce compact fluorescents—but only overseas. Why? Because that's where the major markets are, says Matthew Patrick, director of the non-profit, Hyannis-based Cape and Islands Self-Reliance Corp. The only company tapping the small U.S. market with a factory in this country, says Patrick, is the German manufacturer Osram. This arrangement has us creating jobs, as well as our most efficient bulbs, in places where there is little benefit for Americans.

Why not bring some of those jobs home?

Why are American manufacturers not promoting their energy-efficient products, such as compact fluorescents, in the United States?

Why don't government and industry resume the efforts begun in the 1970s to educate the public about the benefits of energy efficiency, and inform the public about advances in technology?

And why aren't American consumers demanding these products?

Education is the key, especially where energy is perceived to be relatively cheap. Americans may pay less for a gallon of gasoline or a kilowatt hour of electricity than Europeans do, but there are attendant penalties, including environmental degradation and health and economic costs, in our profligate use of energy.

Indeed, the great majority of our environmental problems are energy-related.

According to Patrick, whose agency promotes, conservation, taking advantage of all state-of-the-art energy technology would enable this country to cut its energy use by one third to one half. Imagine what we—as individuals and as a nation—could do with the resulting savings of at least $130 billion.

Such savings would benefit individual household budgets, of course. They would make us far less dependent on imported oil. And they would benefit the environment by reducing the need to develop new energy sources and by reducing problems caused by energy byproducts and disposal.

These benefits require the public's cooperation, however, and that can come only through education. Given the shape of the economy and the burden of cleaning up the environment, it's a wonder that energy conservation no longer is a front-burner issue. With an election year upon us, it ought to—it must—become one.●

IN RECOGNITION OF DR. AND MRS. BRYAN L. CROW

● Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. President, on Sunday, February 2, the congregation of the Garden Church in Anaheim Hills, CA, will honor their pastor and his wife, Dr. and Mrs. Bryan L. Crow, for their 30 years of ministry and service to church and community.

The church family is planning a time of recognition during the 9:30 a.m. worship service Sunday morning and a brief reception following the service to celebrate the occasion. I cannot be in Anaheim Hills on Sunday, but I would like to take this opportunity to extend my best wishes to my friends in Anaheim Hills and my heartfelt gratitude to Dr. and Mrs. Crow for the years of friendship our families have shared.

John Milton wrote, "Freely we serve, because we freely love." Certainly this is an apt description of the spirit of service and love the Crows have shared with the congregation of the Garden Church and the community of Anaheim Hills over the last 30 years.

I ask the Senate to join me in recognizing this milestone for the Crows, the Garden Church, and the community of Anaheim Hills.●

NOTICE OF DETERMINATION BY THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON ETHICS UNDER RULE 35, PARAGRAPH 4, PERMITTING ACCEPTANCE OF A GIFT OF EDUCATIONAL TRAVEL FROM A FOREIGN ORGANIZATION

● Mr. SANFORD. Mr. President, it is required by paragraph 4 of rule 35 that I place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD notices of Senate employees who participate in programs, the principal objective of which is educational, sponsored by a foreign government or a foreign educational or charitable organization involving travel to a foreign country paid for by that foreign government or organization.

The select committee received a request for a determination under rule 35 for John Gorman, a member of the staff of Senator MACK, to participate in a program in Venezuela, sponsored by the Government of Venezuela, from January 12–17, 1992.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Gorman in this program, at the expense of the Government to Venezuela, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.

The select committee received a request for a determination under rule 35 for Warren K. Erdman, a member of the staff of Senator BOND, to participate in a program in China, sponsored by the Chinese National Association of Industry and Commerce, from January 20–24, 1992.

The committee has determined that participation by Mr. Erdman in this program, at the expense of the Chinese National Association of Industry and Commerce, is in the interest of the Senate and the United States.•

UNITED STATES LOAN GUARANTEES TO THE STATE OF ISRAEL

• Mr. D'AMATO. Mr. President, I rise once again in support of the urgently needed $10 billion in loan guarantees to the State of Israel. Loan guarantees, being only guarantees, are vitally important for the resettlement of Soviet and Ethiopian Jewry. I remind my colleagues once again, that a commitment which we made to America's only friend in the Middle East, Israel, must be kept. For this reason, I wish to share with my colleagues a letter from the Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations to President Bush, requesting that the loan guarantees be granted.

The letter follows:

JANUARY 13, 1992.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now that the 120 day postponement for consideration of the refugee absorption loan guarantees has passed, we urge the Administration to proceed expeditiously in its deliberations and its discussions with Israel and to support the necessary legislation to be enacted by Congress.

We regard this vital humanitarian concern as a top priority. We are unanimous in our support for the loan guarantees. The deteriorating situation in the former Soviet Union underscores the urgency of prompt action.

We know that there is a longstanding commitment on the part of the United States to assure the successful absorption of Soviet and Ethiopian Jewish refugees in Israel. You personally played a vital role in obtaining freedom for these beleaguered people and you have made clear your commitment to helping them secure proper housing and employment so they may become productive citizens in their new homeland.

The most effective way to achieve this common goal is to enact quickly legislation which would provide the absorption loan guarantees to Israel.

Respectfully,

Conference of Presidents of Major American Jewish Organizations: Shoshana S. Cardin, Malcolm Hoenlein.

American Gathering/Federation of Jewish Holocaust Survivors: Benjamin Meed, Sam Bloch.

American Jewish Committee: Alfred H. Moses, David Harris.

American Sephardi Federation: Leon Levy, Suri Kasirer.

American Zionist Youth Foundation: Rabbi Joseph P. Sternstein, Donald Adelman.

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith: Melvin Salberg, Abraham H. Foxman.

B'nai B'rith: Kent E. Schiner, Dr. Sidney M. Clearfield.

Bnai Zion: Werner Buckold, Mel Parness.

Council of Jewish Federations: Charles Goodman, Martin Kraar.

Federation of Reconstructionist Synagogues and Havurot: Valerie Kaplan, Rabbi Mordechai Liebling.

Jewish Community Centers Assoc.: Lester Pollack, Arthur Rotman.

Jewish Institute for National Security Affairs: Sen. Rudy Boschwitz, Thomas Neumann.

Mercaz: Rabbi Matthew H. Simon, Renah L. Rabinowitz.

National Committee for Labor Israel: Jay Mazur, Yehuda Ebstein.

National Council of Jewish Women: Joan Bronk, Iris Gross.

National Federation of Temple Sisterhoods: Judith M. Hertz.

American Israel Public Affairs Committee: Mayer Mitchell, Thomas A. Dine.

American Jewish Congress: Robert Lifton, Henry Siegman.

Amit Women: Norma Holzer, Marvin Leff.

American Zionist Federation: Simon Schwartz, Karen Rubinstein.

Association of Reform Zionists of America: Norman D. Schwartz, Rabbi Eric H. Yoffie.

B'nai B'rith Women: Harriet J. Horwitz, Elaine K. Binder.

Central Conference of American Rabbis: Rabbi Walter Jacob, Rabbi Joseph Glaser.

Emunah Women of America: Sondra Fisch, Shirley Singer.

Hadassah: Deborah Kaplan, Beth Wohlgelernter.

Jewish Labor Committee: Lenore Miller, Martin Lapan.

Jewish National Fund: Ruth Popkin, Dr. Samuel I. Cohen.

Jewish War Veterans of USA: Albert L. Cohen, Herb Rosenbleeth.

Na'amat USA: Harriet Green.

National Conference on Soviet Jewry: Shoshana S. Cardin, Martin A. Wenick.

National Council of Young Israel: Chaim Kaminetsky, Rabbi Ephraim Sturm.

National Jewish Community Relations Advisory Council: Arden E. Shenker, Lawrence Rubin.

Rabbinical Assembly: Rabbi Irwin Groner, Rabbi Joel H. Meyers.

Religious Zionists of America: Rabbi Dr. Sol Roth, Israel Friedman.

Union of Councils for Soviet Jews: Pamela Braun Cohen, Micah H. Naftalin.

United Israel Appeal: Norman Lipoff, Herman Markowitz.

United Synagogue of Conservative Judaism: Alan J. Tichnor, Rabbi Jerome M. Epstein.

WIZO: Evelyn Sommer.

Women's League for Conservative Judaism: Audrey Citak, Bernice Balter.

Workmen's Circle: Harold Ostroff, Robert A. Kaplan.

Poale Agudath Israel: Rabbi Fabian Schonfeld, Rabbi Moshe Malinowitz.

Rabbinical Council of America: Rabbi Marc D. Angel, Rabbi Benyamin Walfish.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations: Melvin Merians, Rabbi Alexander M. Schindler.

Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America: Sheldon Rudoff, Mandell I. Ganchrow, M.D.

United Jewish Appeal: Marvin Lender, Rabbi Brian L. Lurie.

Women's American Ort: Sandra Isenstein, Tehila Elpern.

Women's League for Israel: Trudy Miner, Dorothy Leffler.

World Zionist Org./American Section: Bernice Tannebaum, Zelig Chintiz.

Zionist Organization of America: W. James Schiller, Paul Flacks.•

MEASURE INDEFINITELY POSTPONED—S. 343

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that calendar No. 96, S. 343, the high-performance computing bill, be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGARDING A JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS—HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 267

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 267 regarding the joint ssession of Congress just received from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objecton, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 267

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, Janury 28, 1992, at 9 o'clock post meridiem, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 267) was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote.

Mr. SIMPSON. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AUTHORIZATION TO ESCORT THE PRESIDENT INTO THE HOUSE CHAMBER

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President of the Senate be authorized to appoint a committee on the part of the Senate to join with the like committee on the part of the House of Representatives to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber for the joint session this evening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR TOMORROW

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I will shortly ask unanimous consent that

the Senate stand in recess until 8:30 p.m. this evening, and I ask that upon reconvening at 8:30 p.m., the Senate proceed as a body to the House of Representatives to receive the President's message; that upon conclusion of the President's speech, the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. on Wednesday, January 29; that following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be deemed approved to date; that following the time for the two leaders, there then be a period for morning business not to extend beyond 1 p.m., with Senators permitted to speak therein, with Senator NUNN recognized for up to 15 minutes, with the time from 11:30 a.m. until 12:30 p.m. to be under the control of the Republican leader of his designee, and that during the period between 12:30 p.m. and 1 p.m., Senators LAUTENBERG and WOFFORD be recognized for up to 10 minutes each, and Senator SIMON up to 5 minutes; that at 1 p.m. the Senate resume consideration of S. 12, the Cable Television Consumer Protection Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REGARDING EL SALVADOR—SENATE RESOLUTION 248

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that when the Senate considers Senate Resolution 248, regarding El Salvador, that there be 10 minutes for debate on the resolution with the time equally divided and controlled in the usual form, and that no amendments or motions be in order to the resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS UNTIL 8:30 P.M.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess as previously ordered.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 5:58 p.m., recessed until 8:30 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer [Mr. WELLSTONE].

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SHELBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOINT SESSION OF THE TWO HOUSES—MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 176)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives for the joint session, and upon the conclusion of the joint session, the Senate will stand in recess until 11 a.m., Wednesday, January 29, 1992.

Thereupon, at 8:35 p.m., the Senate, preceded by the Secretary of the Senate, Walter J. Stewart, and the Sergeant at Arms, Martha S. Pope, proceeded to the Hall of the House of Representatives to hear the address by the President of the United States, George Bush.

(The address by the President of the United States, this day delivered by him to the joint session of the two Houses of Congress, appears in the proceedings of the House of Representatives in today's RECORD.)

RECESS UNTIL TOMORROW AT 11 A.M.

At the conclusion of the joint session of the two Houses, and in accordance with the order previously entered into, at 10 p.m., the Senate recessed until tomorrow, January 29, 1992, at 11 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate, January 28, 1992:

RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION

ALBERT V. CASEY, OF TEXAS, TO BE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER, RESOLUTION TRUST CORPORATION, (NEW POSITION), TO WHICH POSITION HE WAS APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE.

FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS TO BE DIRECTORS OF THE FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE BOARD, TO WHICH POSITIONS THEY WERE APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE:

WILLIAM C. PERKINS, OF WISCONSIN, FOR A TERM OF 1 YEAR. (NEW POSITION)
LAWRENCE U. COSTIGLIO, OF NEW YORK, FOR A TERM OF 3 YEARS. (NEW POSITION)
MARILYN R. SEYMANN, OF ARIZONA, FOR A TERM OF 5 YEARS. (NEW POSITION)
DANIEL F. EVANS, JR., OF INDIANA, FOR A TERM OF 7 YEARS. (NEW POSITION)

LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION

THE FOLLOWING NAMED PERSONS TO BE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE LEGAL SERVICES CORPORATION FOR THE TERMS INDICATED, TO WHICH POSITIONS THEY WERE APPOINTED DURING THE LAST RECESS OF THE SENATE:

FOR TERMS EXPIRING JULY 13, 1992:
J. BLAKELEY HALL, OF TEXAS.
WILLIAM LEE KIRK, JR., OF FLORIDA.
JO BETTS LOVE, OF MISSISSIPPI.
GUY V. MOLINARI, OF NEW YORK.
JEANINE E. WOLBECK, OF MINNESOTA.

FOR TERMS EXPIRING JULY 13, 1993:
HOWARD H. DANA, JR., OF MAINE.
PENNY L. PULLEN, OF ILLINOIS.
THOMAS D. RATH, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.
BASILE J. UDDO, OF LOUISIANA.
GEORGE W. WITTGRAF, OF IOWA.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Tuesday, January 28, 1992*

The House met at 12 noon.

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

Give us the grace, O God, to speak our words with the wisdom of the years, with a commitment to the truth, with a passion for justice, with a sensitivity to the needs of others and with discernment for the requirements of the Nation. Before we think or speak or act may our motives be genuine and righteous so all our energies will be directed to the welfare and good will of all people. To that end, gracious God, we pray Your blessing upon each of us. Amen.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the order of the House of Wednesday, January 22, 1992, the House will now proceed to organizational business.

The Clerk will utilize the electronic system to ascertain the presence of a quorum.

Members will record their presence by electronic device.

The call was taken by electronic device, and the following Members responded to their names:

[Roll No. 1]

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Armey
Atkins
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Boucher
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)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Darden
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
English
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Foley
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
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
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Johnson (CT)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Montgomery
Moody
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Porter
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schiff
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stallings
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Torricelli
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Wilson
Wolf
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

□ 1224

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 374 Members have recorded their presence by electronic device.

Under the rule, further proceedings under the call are dispensed with.

APPROVAL OF JOURNALS OF JANUARY 22, 1992, AND JANUARY 24, 1992

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journals of January 22, 1992 and January 24, 1992 and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1 of rule I, these Journals stand approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BARTON], come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance?

Mr. BARTON of Texas 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 has passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 2720. An act to extend for one year the authorization of appropriations for the programs under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and for certain programs relating to adoption opportunities, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2720) "An act to extend for 1 year the authorizations of appropriations for the programs under the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act and the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, and for certain programs relating to adoption opportunities, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DODD, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HATCH, and Mr. COATS, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1056. An act to provide for an architectural and engineering design competition for the construction, renovation, and repair of certain public buildings, and for other purposes; and

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution concerning the emancipation of the Baha'i community of Iran.

COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 328) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 328

Resolved, That a committee of two Members be appointed by the Speaker on the part of the House of Representatives to join with a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has assembled and Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT, PURSUANT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 328

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to join a committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled, and that Congress is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

NOTIFICATION TO THE SENATE

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 329) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. RES. 329

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House inform the Senate that a quorum of the House is present and that the House is ready to proceed with business.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1230

LONGEVITY RECORD SET BY JAMIE WHITTEN

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 6 our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], served his 18,325th day in the House of Representatives, and today begins his 52d session serving as a Member of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, it was on January 6, 1963, that then Majority Leader Carl Albert addressed the Speaker of the House, John McCormack, to note that Carl Vinson had just exceeded the longevity record set by Sam Rayburn. However, Mr. Speaker, neither of them compares with the record of 50 years and 2 months service, nearly one-quarter of the history of this Republic that has been recorded, and served with greater distinction than the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. Speaker, he has seen nine Presidents of the United States come and go, and, as Dean of the House, he has sworn in every Speaker for the last eight Congresses. He came here a month before Pearl Harbor and has participated in some of the greatest developments in our country's history.

Since 1949, except for a brief interregnum, he has been the chairman of the Subcommittee on Rural Development, Agriculture and Related Agencies of the Committee on Appropriations, the longest service of any subcommittee chairman of Appropriations in history. From that post he has fought for crop subsidies, rural electrification, soil conservation, and rural home loan programs to help transform rural America.

But his impact has extended far beyond agriculture. Indeed there are few areas of public life that do not bear his mark. He has used his power as chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to effect his philosophy that the Nation's wealth is not measured by money primarily, but by its human and physical assets.

We all know that Mississippi, especially the First District, has received its fair share of Federal help. But the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] has seen to it that the national programs do in fact have national impact, and he has probably helped just about every Member of this House with some special local need.

His influence comes from his position, but not just from his position. No one begrudges his power because a simple fact is that no Member here serves with greater grace or charm or gentleness or purpose than does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Mr. Speaker, the newest Member of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BLACKWELL], has served for a little over 2 months. I hope he will not mind if I say publicly that, if he reaches the record of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], he will reach it in the month of January 2042, and, if he should reach that greater period of service and become, of course, the most senior Member in history, I think he will find in looking back on his career that one of his greatest friends, and supporters and helpers, as he has been to all Members of this body, Democrat and Republican, has been the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN].

Congratulations, Mr. Chairman.

[Applause.]

DAILY HOUR OF MEETING

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 330) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 330

Resolved, That until otherwise ordered, the hour of meeting of the House shall be noon on Mondays and Tuesdays; 2 o'clock post meridiem on Wednesdays; 11 o'clock ante meridiem on all other days of the week up to and including May 15, 1992; and that from May 16, 1992, until the end of the second session, the hour of daily meeting of the House shall be noon on Mondays and Tuesdays and 10 o'clock ante meridiem on all other days of the week.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INDIAN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5506(a) of Public Law 100–297, the Chair on April 25, 1991, designated the following members to the Advisory Committee of the White House Conference on Indian Education on the part of the House:

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado;

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska;

Mr. Don Barlow of Spokane, WA;

Mr. Joseph Martin of Kayenta, AZ; and

Mrs. Kathryn D. Manuelito of Albuquerque, NM.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON INDIAN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section 5503(b) of Public Law 100–297, the Chair selects the following participants to the White House Conference on Indian Education on the part of the House:

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska;

Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado;

Mr. MILLER of California;

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa;

Ms. Melvina Phillips of Huntsville, AL;

Ms. Anita Bradley Pfeiffer of Window Rock, AZ;

Mr. Leroy N. Shingoitewa of Tuba City, AZ;

Ms. Jane B. Wilson of Flagstaff, AZ;

Ms. Theresa Natoni Price of Mesa, AZ;
Ms. Isabelle Deschinney of Window Rock, AZ;
Mr. Jack C. Jackson of Window Rock, AZ;
Mr. Grayson Noley of Scottsdale, AZ;
Mr. Dean C. Jackson of Chinle, AZ;
Mr. Mitchell Burns of Scottsdale, AZ;
Mr. Matthew Levario of Scottsdale, AZ;
Ms. Kathryn Stevens of Phoenix, AZ;
Mr. Gilbert Innis of Phoenix, AZ;
Ms. Linda S. Santillan of Fremont, CA;
Mr. Orie Medicinebull of Auberry, CA;
Ms. Peggy Ann Vega of Bishop, CA;
Mr. Monty Bengochia of Bishop, CA;
Ms. Debra Echo-Hawk of Boulder, CO;
Ms. Josephine M. North of Hollywood, FL;
Mr. Billy Cypress of Miami, FL;
Mr. Adrian Pushetonegua of Tama, IA;
Mr. Terry D. Martin of Franklin, LA;
Mr. Thomas G. Miller of Cooks, MI;
Mr. John Hatch of Sault Ste. Marie, MI;
Ms. Sharon Kota of Port Huron, MI;
Mr. Paul Johnson of Haslett, MI;
Ms. Pam Dunham of East Lansing, MI;
Mr. Donald E. Wiesen of Cloouet, MN;
Ms. Rosemary Christensen of Duluth, MN;
Ms. Donna L. Buckles of Poplar, MT;
Mrs. Karen Cornelius-Fenton of St. Ignatius, MT;
Ms. Bernadette Dimas of Poplar, MT;
Ms. Tracie Ann McDonald-Buckless of Ronan, MT;
Mrs. Janine Pease-Windy Boy of Lodge Grass, MT;
Ms. Jean Peterson of Las Vegas, NV;
Mr. Joseph Abeyta of Santa Fe, NM;
Ms. Genevieve R. Jackson of Kirtland, NM;
Mr. Paul Tosa of Jemez Pueblo, NM;
Ms. Mary T. Cohoe of Pine Hill, NM;
Mr. Melvin H. Martinez of Espanola, NM;
Mr. William A. Mitchell of Bombay, NY;
Ms. Michele Dean Stock of Great Valley, NY;
Mrs. Betty Jane Mangum of Raleigh, NC;
Ms. Wanda M. Carter of Charlotte, NC;
Mrs. Mary Jo Cole of Tahlequah, OK;
Mr. Jim Quetone of Tahlequah, OK;
Mr. Ray Henson of Talihina, OK;
Ms. Nita Magdalena of Shawnee, OK;
Mr. David M. Gipp of Mandan, ND;
Mr. Sylvester G. Sahme, Sr. of Warm Springs, OR;
Ms. LaVonne Lobert-Edmo of Salem, OR;
Mr. Anthony Whirlwind Horse of Pine Ridge, SD;
Ms. Sue Braswell of Nashville, TN;
Ms. Annette Arkeketa of Corpus Christi, TX;
Mr. Edward Sandoval, III of Fort Worth, TX;
Mr. Clayton J. Small of Chattaroy, WA;
Ms. Darlena Watt-Palmanteer of Nespelem, WA;
Ms. Letoy Eike of Seattle, WA;
Mr. Daniel Iyall of Spokane, WA;
Mr. David C. Bonga of Spokane, WA;
Ms. LaVerne Lane-Oreiro of Bellingham, WA;
Ms. Marion Forsman-Boushie of Indianola, WA;
Mr. Don A. Barlow of Spokane, WA;
Mr. Joseph Martin of Kayenta, AZ;
Mrs. Kathryn D. Manuelito of Albuquerque, NM;
Mr. Eddie Brown of Washington, DC;
Mr. Ed Parisian of Washington, DC;
Mr. Tim Wapato of Washington, DC;
Mr. John W. Tippeconnic III of Washington, DC;
Mr. Eddie Tullis of Atmore, AL;
Mr. Andrew Lorrentine of Bells, AZ;
Mr. Linus Everling of Washington, DC;
Mr. Roger Iron Cloud of Washington, DC; and
Ms. Kathleen Annette of Bemidji, MN.

□ 1240

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of 243(a)(2) of Public Law 102-138, the Chair appoints the following members to the Commission on Broadcasting to the People's Republic of China on the part of the House:
Mr. Ben J. Wattenberg of Washington, DC; and
Mr. Leonard H. Marks of Washington, DC.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF COMMISSION ON BROADCASTING TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable ROBERT H. MICHEL, minority leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 14, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On November 22, 1991 I notified the President of my appointment of Mr. Steven Mosher of Upland, California, and Mr. James L. Tyson of Darien, Connecticut, to the Commission on Broadcasting to the People's Republic of China in accordance with the provisions set forth in Public Law 102-138.

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT H. MICHEL,
Minority Leader.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBER OF NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON THE PUBLIC SERVICE ACT OF 1990

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable BOB MICHEL, Republican leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 27, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to Sec. 5(a)(2) of Public Law 101-363, I hereby appoint the gentlewoman from Maryland, Mrs. Morella, to serve as a member of the National Advisory Council on the Public Service Act of 1990.

Sincerely yours,
BOB MICHEL,
Republican Leader.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Pending the return of the committee appointed to notify the President on the part of the House that the House and Senate are prepared to receive any communications from him, the Chair will receive 1-minute requests from the Members of the House.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE JAMIE WHITTEN, DEAN OF THE HOUSE AND DEAN OF THE MISSISSIPPI DELEGATION

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

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Chair for giving me this opportunity to speak.

I had the privilege of coming to the well of this Chamber on November 5, 1991, to announce that on that day the dean of our Mississippi delegation and the dean of this House, Congressman JAMIE WHITTEN, marked his 50th anniversary of service in the House of Representatives.

I would point out to my colleagues that the Speaker has talked about this today, but I thought that as the next ranking Member to Mr. WHITTEN on our Mississippi congressional delegation, I would also like to make brief comments.

It is my honor today to again come to the well to pay tribute to Mr. WHITTEN. On January 6, 1992, he broke the record of the late Congressman Carl Vinson of Georgia, and he has now become the longest serving American in the history of the House of Representatives. Mr. Vinson's record was 50 years, 2 months, and 13 days. Each day Mr. WHITTEN serves now will add to this, I believe, almost unbreakable record.

His colleagues in the Mississippi delegation are proud of Mr. WHITTEN, as are all his fellow Mississippians. The Mississippi Society of Washington will pay tribute to him on February 5 with a reception in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, let me say this: Mr. WHITTEN, I know I speak for all of our colleagues today when I say that we salute you for a lifetime of service not only to our State but to our great Nation.

TAX RELIEF AND JOBS CREATION SHOULD BE FEATURED IN STATE OF THE UNION MESSAGE

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

Mr. PAXON. Mr. Speaker, in about 8 hours the President will enter this Chamber and deliver his annual State of the Union address to the Nation. I hope the President speaks forcefully over the heads of this Congress and directly to the American people. I am confident that he will tell America of the crucial need for tax relief and jobs creation, about the need for an increase in the personal exemption, tax credits for minor children, individual retirement accounts, a tax credit for firsttime home buyers and those who buy American cars, as well as cuts in capital gains and reestablishing investment tax credits to create jobs.

But the President cannot do it alone. If this Congress is serious about getting the economy growing again, it can act on economic growth, and do so now with no bickering and no gamesmanship.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to challenge Congress with a deadline, a solid date by which this Congress shall act on economic growth and job creation, and then America will see whether or not this Congress is serious about getting America back to work again.

THE CRUCIAL ISSUE OF HEALTH CARE

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

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, along with many other Members of the House, I had a public forum at home, in Louisville, KY, on health care. Over 300 people attended my forum. Fifty people took the time to speak and deliver messages. We did not achieve a consensus on what should be done, but we established that there is a clear problem with health care in the United States.

Tonight, in a few hours, just a few feet from where I am now standing, the President will deliver his State of the Union Message. I hope that the President devotes a great deal of his time to the question of health care. I hope he features it. But I hope that what I have heard up to now is not the sum of his remarks tonight. I hope he does not recommend simply to give the people tax credits or some type of tax deduction and let the people go out in the health care market and fend for themselves.

I am very much for the free market. I think the unfettered, unregulated market system operates, for the most part, very well, but it does not operate well in the health care field.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the President does not just cut the people loose to sink or swim in the ocean of health care reform because I fear that too many of them may sink.

A COORDINATED EFFORT NEEDED IN THE WAR ON DRUGS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, fighting the scourge of illegal drug abuse must be done at every level because the war on drugs cannot be won on only one battlefront.

Not only must our communities and schools work together to curb drug demand, but our Federal Government must work internationally to combat the problem of drug supply.

The importance of the drug summit to be held next month in San Antonio cannot be underscored. President Bush and the leaders of six Latin American nations will convene to coordinate their counternarcotics operations.

Supply reduction is the key to driving down drug use. The national drug control strategy concentrates on drug trafficking organizations and targets broad-based efforts in interdiction to prevent drugs from entering the United States.

An example of our progress can be seen in 1991 when Customs, the Border Patrol, and the Coast Guard made over 17,000 drug-related arrests, and seized 229,000 pounds of cocaine and 3,000 pounds of heroin.

The President's strategy can help us succeed in the war on drugs.

THE PROBLEM OF THE FEDERAL DEFICIT

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

Mr. DERRICK. Mr. President, we await your address to the Nation this evening. We await it and we anticipate that what we are going to hear, here in the Congress——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina will address the Speaker and not the President.

Mr. DERRICK. We look forward to working together with the administration to bring about a new economic policy for this country.

We would recall that as we went into the 1980's, we were the largest creditor Nation in the world. Today we are the largest debtor Nation. As we began the 1980's, we had a national annual deficit of some $60 billion. It now approaches $220 billion. As we began the 1980's, we had a debt that had been accumulated over a 200-year period of some $1 trillion. Today it approaches $4 trillion.

□ 1250

I say this to say that the policies of the 1980's have not worked. I ask not for a quick fix. The people of this country are not interested in a dollar-a-day tax refund. They are interested in being guaranteed that they are going to have jobs throughout the balance of this century and well into the 21st century.

THE HOUSE SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

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

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, we are back here at the beginning of the second session of this Congress, but I would like to call the attention of Members to the last day of the first session.

Mr. Speaker, you may recall in our rush to get out of town we committed $25 billion to the Resolution Trust Corporation and $30 billion to the FDIC, both without a recorded vote. Fifty-five billion dollars was spent that last afternoon without a recorded vote so that we could return and hide and go wherever we wanted to go.

But that was only part of the story. In addition to that, in 1991 the House approved by voice vote $392 billion through appropriations conference reports, including $13 billion for two continuing resolutions and $65 billion in direct spending bills, all on voice votes. So I am suggesting that we get off to a much more accountable start in this, the second session.

Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the House Spending Accountability Act, which would simply require that recorded votes must be taken on priority spending bills. The public deserves to know how we stand and how we vote.

TIME FOR A NEW AGENDA

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, tonight marks the real first day of the 12th year of the Reagan-Bush administration. We have had 11 years of a Republican philosophy that has taken the country into massive deficits and has resulted in the current economic hardships people feel all over this Nation.

It is time for a break from the past. It is time for a road map for the future.

I, along with the rest of the Nation, will be listening carefully to what President Bush has to say tonight in his State of the Union Address. The ball is in his court. He needs to provide the leadership to create jobs, to make our tax system more equitable and to

guarantee health care for all our people. And he needs to get tough with the Japanese and our other trading partners who are harming American workers.

Once the President has presented his program, Democrats will be prepared to respond and to initiate our own proposals in those areas where he falls short.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to end the failed policies of the last 11 years. It's time for a new agenda—either from this President or from someone else.

CONGRESS SHOULD HEED PRESIDENT'S CALL FOR ACTION

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

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, tonight in this Chamber the President will deliver his State of the Union Address. We all know that the President is going to have a call for action, and action is what our country needs.

Mr. Speaker, I have just completed 47 townhall meetings throughout northeast Wisconsin. Over and over again Wisconsinites have told me what your constituents are telling you, that they want an end to the bickering and an end to political in-fighting here on Capitol Hill.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want solutions. They want united action by all branches of government, and they want our country's leaders to take action.

So when the President calls for action this evening, I hope that Members in this House will act without delay, and let us work with our President for the good of this country.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, your committee on the part of the House to join a like committee on the part of the Senate to notify the President of the United States that a quorum of each House has been assembled and is ready to receive any communication that he may be pleased to make has performed that duty.

Mr. Speaker, the President has asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and me to report that he will be pleased to deliver his message at 9 p.m. tonight to a joint session of the two Houses.

JOINT SESSION OF CONGRESS—STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 267) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 267

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the two Houses of Congress assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives on Tuesday, January 28, 1992, at 9 o'clock post meridian, for the purpose of receiving such communication as the President of the United States shall be pleased to make to them.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

After consultation with the majority and minority leaders, and with their consent and approval, the Chair announces that tonight when the Houses meet in joint session to hear an address by the President of the United States, only the doors immediately opposite the Speaker and those on his left and right will be open.

No one will be allowed on the floor of the House who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

Due to the large attendance which is anticipated, the Chair feels that the rule regarding the privilege of the floor must be strictly adhered to.

Children of Members will not be permitted on the floor, and the cooperation of all Members is requested.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO DECLARE RECESSES AT ANY TIME ON TODAY, SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order at any time today for the Speaker to declare recesses, subject to the call of the Chair, for the purpose of receiving in joint session the President of the United States.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY, JANUARY 30, 1992, TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1992

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Thursday, January 30, 1992, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday, February 3, 1992.

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

There was no objection.

COMMEMORATION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MACE

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, 150 years ago, when the 27th Congress gathered in the old House Chamber, the historic mace we have before us was used for the very first time on December 29, 1841.

This silver and ebony mace is the symbol of authority of the House of Representatives, and to quote our first Speaker, Frederick Muhlenburg: "A proper symbol of office" for the Sergeant at Arms.

The mace we honor today was commissioned in August 1841, by Speaker John White. It is an exquisite example of the silversmith's art, and remains a visible reminder that our National Legislature has roots in the traditions of the Roman Republic and the British Parliament.

During the 77th Congress, when the mace began its second century of use, an occasion which apparently went unnoticed and unrecognized, JAMIE WHITTEN had served a month and a half the first of his 25 terms, in the House, and Sam Rayburn had just begun his tenure as Speaker. Also present in the House during this time was Thomas D'Alesandro, a second term Member from Maryland and NANCY PELOSI's father, as well as John D. Dingell, father of Chairman JOHN DINGELL.

G.K. Chesterton once wrote:

> The disadvantage of men not knowing the past is that they do not know the present. History is a hill or high point of vantage, from which alone men see the town in which they live or the age in which they are living.

History is continuity, and celebrating history—especially the history of this institution—reminds us that we are part of a larger tradition of representative democracy. And it gives us an ideal to live up to as Congress confronts the issues before the American people today.

These are historic times in which we live, and an especially appropriate time to remember the strength and the vitality and, yes, the living history of this institution and its capacity for greatness.

Since 1841, this emblem of the authority of the House of Representatives has borne silent witness to the proceedings of this Chamber. We take great pride today in recognizing and celebrating its 150th year of service to the U.S. House of Representatives.

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

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

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] in commemorating the 150th anniversary of the mace, the symbol of authority and order in the House of Representatives.

It sometimes seems that in the House nothing is more ephemeral than permanency. There is a constant shift of allegiance in which Members form temporary alliances on new bills, new Members are elected, and old Members leave in one way or another.

But amidst the swirl of events, amidst the tumult and change, we can look to the right of the Speaker's chair and see the mace of the House of Representatives.

□ 1300

It reminds us of the continuity, the history, and the permanence of the House, yes, and of our Republic. If any of us ever gets the idea that he or she is irreplaceable, the mace tells us by its silent but eloquent presence that what matters is not the individual but the institution itself.

The mace and the authority it symbolizes is a striking and visible reminder of a great and invisible power, and that is the power of a free people to choose their own Representatives.

A symbol cannot command respect, but it can remind us by its very presence of ideas and realities that deserve our respect. That is what the mace does, every day we are in session.

I am glad to be able to join with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the distinguished majority leader, to pay tribute to the mace that I first saw, I guess as a Congressman on a January day 35 years ago.

Back then, as a freshman Member of this House, I was in awe of what the mace represented. Yes, and 35 years has not distinguished the sense of awe but only increased it.

Yet today, as I look behind me to determine whether I should address the Chair as "Mr. Speaker," the mace obviously is on its pedestal. If the mace is down below, the obvious salutation or at least beginning is "Mr. Chairman" for addressing the Committee of the Whole House. So good that we should honor in this institution that which gives us such authority.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] for this fine statement.

WORKING WITH THE PRESIDENT

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, every day I read the papers with renewed amazement. The world I grew up in is gone. The old concepts that formed our vision and controlled our actions have been swept away.

We now have an opportunity as remarkable as that given to the people who founded this country: To lead the United States during a time of rapid change into a future full of possibilities and promise.

The President tonight will outline his vision of that future, and detail his plan to lead us there. I look forward to hearing what the President has to say, and to working with him during this pivotal point in history.

The needs that must be addressed are clear to the people in Connecticut. As I stood with them in the unemployment lines and in town meetings, they asked for new initiatives to turn the economy around, create jobs, and provide businesses with the capital to invest in new enterprise.

People, with and without jobs, came to me with horror stories about the lack of adequate health care and the tremendous expense of the health care they do get.

Our economy needs to be prepared for global competition unlike any we have ever faced, through better education, fair trade laws that break down international barriers, reform of our banking industry, and a strong industrial policy.

I look forward to tonights message with great anticipation, hoping that the President will offer a vision of our future that addresses these pressing concerns, and that all Americans can follow.

A FAT-FREE FRANK

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

Mr. THOMAS of California. Mr. Speaker, there are calls for a new agenda, but some things just do not change. Polls show that incumbents are in trouble. Incumbent Members in the House are in trouble for one big reason, incumbent arrogance.

The most recent example is the shenanigans with the frank. Taxpayers are now learning and are becoming outraged that their dollars can be used to send campaign informational mailings to people who are outside the Member's district. It may be legal, but it is not right. Let me repeat that. It may be legal, but it is not right.

I am introducing a bill that removes the statutory support for this activity. This bill deserves our support. I hope Members will support it. Join me in a fat-free frank.

AMERICA IS TIRED OF READING GEORGE'S LIPS

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

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. Speaker, for 3½ years now we have heard a lot of speeches by President Bush on what he is going to do. Isn't it about time he did some of it?

The President promised 30 million jobs in 8 years.

Now we have 2 million more Americans out of work than when he took office.

The President told us he wanted a comprehensive health care proposal, but it is disappearing even before his speech is given.

He has told us he was the Education President, but Federal aid for public education is half what it was a decade ago.

He declared war on drugs, but the streets are awash in cocaine and heroin.

Tonight, he comes back to the Hill for his fourth State of the Union address. He will tell us how he wants to revitalize the sagging economy.

Mr. Speaker, the American people are clamoring for action. They are tired of reading George Bush's lips. Lip service is all they have gotten out of Washington for too long.

They want the President and Congress to get down to business, especially now, when millions of Americans are feeling real pain from the recession.

That takes more than speeches. It takes the President and the Congress talking to each other, not past each other. It takes rolling up the sleeves and hard work; creative thinking and compromise to come up with a plan to get this country moving again.

STOP WASTEFUL GOVERNMENT SPENDING SUPPORT THOMAS FAT-FREE FRANKING

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

Mr. BARTON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the congressional mailroom was very busy last week. In one 2-day period, 58 million pieces of mail were sent out. That is right. Fifty-eight million.

Some of this mail was legitimate constituent correspondence, but much was nothing more than thinly veiled campaign propaganda, sent at taxpayer expense into prospective new areas that Members might represent.

Yes, some Members are mailing not into their existing districts, but to potentially new areas.

The gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, has introduced a bill to stop this unethical practice. The bill has already been endorsed by newspapers with as widely different editorial viewpoints as the New York Times and the Washington Times.

The bill is simple. Members of Congress will only be allowed to send updates and congressional newsletters to their existing constituents.

The House leadership is pushing for a 26-percent increase in Congress' own in-house budget this year. There is only one reason for such a huge increase. Some Congressmen are trying to use taxpayer money to be elected to new, post-redistricting districts. That is unethical, and we should make it illegal.

Support the Thomas fat-free franking bill.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSAL ON HEALTH-CARE REFORM SIDETRACKED

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

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, what happened to the President's health care proposal? The President promised the country he would send to Congress a significant proposal to improve America's health care system.

Now we learn the President's budget is being rewritten and health care reform will be submitted at a later date. This is like the old "My dog ate my homework" defense. Just as it does not wash in school, it does not wash here.

This country is calling on its President to come up with a serious, long-term plan to get us through the decade. Not a short-term Band-Aid to get him through the election. Health care, jobs, tax fairness for the middle class, lowering the deficit—these are the issues that demand a well thought out State of the Union speech.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I hope President Bush will offer some serious long-term plans and not more politically motivated Band-Aids. If he is serious, Congress will be more than happy to help him. But, if tonight's speech is more of the same Republican help the rich, soak the rest leftovers, then Congress will as before fight for the middle class in this country.

SPEAKER'S SLUSH FUND

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

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I received a call from one of my constituents, Jeff Nunes. He was furious. Jeff had read a story in one of our Pittsburgh newspapers that reported approval of $20,000 to put new marble floors on three House elevators. Mr. Speaker, this type of spending habit only serves to reinforce that the slush fund of the Speaker and some of the leaders on the other side of the aisle is being used for lavish spending, while many Americans are out of jobs, out of work, and out of any hope for recovery.

I am not here just to criticize this House's leadership, but to question the process used to authorize spending under the legislative branch appropriations bill. Here's another case where unspent funds from congressional accounts are being used and spent by the Speaker without the consent, much less even the knowledge of other Members of Congress.

This Speaker's slush fund is an embarrassment to the Congress.

Last fall I sponsored several bills and amendments that would improve the handling of such situations to prohibit the reprogramming of funds and to give the money that is used, that is not spent in congressional accounts, back to the Treasury to reduce the deficit, not to be spent on marble floors.

I also sponsored legislation that would open up books to the American public. The American public has a right to know and see how our money is being spent.

I would plead with the Speaker to eliminate this slush fund and allow for that money to be spent to reduce the deficit.

□ 1310

THE PRESS SHOULD CLEAN UP ITS ACT

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

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, this sleazy rag, the Star, that brings us stories about three-headed Martians and pregnant 94-year-old women is now setting the agenda for the Presidential race. This is a sad day for American journalism when the mainstream press sees fit to follow a tabloid that is forced to pay for their stories.

The star of the Star, Gennifer Flowers, has a massive credibility problem as well, yet her wild accusations and not the issues might tumble the candidacy of Gov. Bill Clinton, who has made the mistake of discussing the issues in the Presidential race.

Mr. Speaker, the press questions the credibility of politicians. The time has come for the press to look in the mirror and to clean up their act as well.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOURTH ANNUAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to congratulate the President on the submission of his fourth annual drug control strategy.

Over the past year our Nation has been distracted by such dramatic events as the collapse of the Soviet Union, the freeing of the American hostages held in Lebanon and, of course, Operation Desert Storm. Now, President Bush's fourth strategy reminds us of the important matters at home—including our Nation's critical antidrug efforts.

President Bush is commended for the international attention he has focused on the drug war. In 1988, we spent about $4.6 billion in antidrug efforts, now the administration is requesting $13 billion in antidrug funding for fiscal year 1993, that is a tripling of Federal resources in the last 5 years.

But all of these expenditures will be meaningless unless all of us throughout our Nation commit ourselves to work for a drug-free nation—in our homes and our communities. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with our President and the Office of the National Drug Control Policy to make 1993 a victory year in our drug war and in drug abuse reduction.

PRESIDENT SHOULD ENFORCE U.S. TRADE LAWS

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, every year the American people get more promises in the State of the Union Address. This year is no different. In 3 short years the promises of President Bush have gone from "Read my lips" to "Dial 911." But the problem with that, Mr. Speaker, is when the American taxpayers dial 911 they get a recording at the new world order instructing them to deposit a few more yen.

Mr. Speaker, I think the President would be wise to stop the promises and start enforcing the laws of America, especially the trade laws of this country as they deal with Japan and China, before the President goes down in history as the most popular one-term President of all time.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 967, BILL TO REPEAL THE SOCIAL SECURITY EARNINGS TEST

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I rise for two purposes. First, I am looking forward to the President's message tonight to the Nation. I look forward to supporting him on new health care provisions, an economic package, the education initiatives, and initiatives to preserve our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise to support H.R. 967, a bill to repeal the Social Security earnings limit on senior citizens between the ages to 65 and 69. I urge

the conferees in the Older Americans Act reauthorization bill to keep the Senate language. This policy is outdated and must be changed so seniors can meet their high costs of living and maintain financial independence.

Under current law senior between the ages of 65 of 69 who receive Social Security benefits and must work to make ends meet can only $10,200 before having to forfeit $1 in Social Security benefits for every $3 earned. While this policy may have worked well in the past, it no longer meets the needs of the economy nor the needs of senior citizens.

According to the U.S. Department of Labor, in January 1989, 61 percent of workers age 63 and older were working because they need the money. At the same time, the Department of Labor warns of shortages in the labor market. There is a demand for skilled, dependable workers.

Furthermore, other forms of income do not disqualify our Social Security benefits. Retired senior citizens who receive unearned income, like that from interest or dividends, in excess of the current earnings test do not have any limit on their Social Security benefits.

This type of inequity needs to be changed, Mr. Speaker. I look forward to these changes and I look forward to the President's speech.

FOCUSING ATTENTION ON AMERICA'S CHILDREN

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, in 1988, the President wrapped himself in the flag for the campaign. It looks like this year he is trying to wrap himself around America's children. Actually I would prefer the Captain Kangaroo act to the Rambo act.

I just want to say I think it was Members of this House and the Senate who voted for Kidsnet, that maybe finally got his attention. We all know if we feed America's children, if we immunize America's children and if we send them to Head Start they get off to a much better start. Unfortunately, the President promised to do those things in 1988 and then forgot to do it. Hopefully in his budget tonight he is going to remember.

The House and the Senate both passed the full funding for that in our Kidsnet. The President said he would veto the bill that that was in. Let us hope that he has rethought it, because over two-thirds of America's children eligible for Head Start still are not there. We know we have now 3 million more children in poverty than when he took over. We know the immunization rates are worse than many African and Latin American countries. That is shameful.

It is time we focus on America's children. Let us see more Captain Kangaroo from everybody.

FOREIGN FIRMS FLEECING THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

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

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, foreign companies fleece the American taxpayer by not paying their fair share of taxes in the United States. Foreign companies—primarily but not all Japanese owe the United States Treasury a minimum of $35 to $50 billion in unpaid taxes for 1983-87 period, plus penalties, fines, and interest which would bring that tax bill to $150 billion. And then there are the next 4 years, what America could do with that money. The U.S. trade deficit could disappear. We could provide extended unemployment benefits for the unemployed—or apply part of the money to educate our young and repair our aging infrastructure.

But Mr. Hideo Takahashi, Assistant Director of International Economic Affairs for the Keidanren, objects to the U.S. effort to collect the taxes. He objects to requiring financial information from Japanese companies and their parent companies. American firms disclose this information in Japan and wherever it is required in the world—yet American companies still compete and pay their taxes. It is time to collect the unpaid taxes from all foreign firms—plus the interest, penalties, and fines. These foreign firms should stop fleecing American taxpayers by paying their fair share of taxes for the benefits received from this Nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1992 AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE RESOLUTION

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

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the President ponders his State of the Union Address, I encourage him to focus on the real needs of this Nation. Ask anyone in any city or town in this country and they will freely tell you the state of the Union. They will tell you that we are in need of rebuilding this Nation—the economy, the infrastructure, and housing. We need to provide jobs for the American worker.

There is a nationwide jobs emergency and this Government must immediately respond to the need. That is why today I will be introducing two legislative measures that will help set the national employment agenda, and that will help create jobs to build the infrastructure of this country, improve the quality of life, and return dignity to American workers. Common sense should tell us that the best way to decrease the deficit is to put people back to work—to increase our revenue by increasing the pool of taxpayers.

The first measure, the quality of life resolution, sets a policy statement for this Nation for full employment and the second measure, the Infrastructure Improvement and Job Opportunities Act of 1992 will create job opportunities at community-based jobs projects that renovate and rehabilitate the public infrastructure.

The state of the Union, Mr. Speaker, is apparent on every corner of every city and town, and those that are suffering can no longer be ignored. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues' support for the Infrastructure Improvement and Job Opportunities Act and the quality of life resolution, and look forward to their adoption.

□ 1320

THE FOURTH NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

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

Mr. RAMSTAD. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to see that yesterday, the President released his fourth national drug control strategy, proposing an increase in Federal funding for drug treatment programs to $2.3 billion for 1993.

Tragically, 5.5 million addicted people still need treatment, but providers have had to turn many of these people away. I applauded President Bush's proposed capacity expansion program, which would provide additional drug treatment slots for those who need them most.

In addition, we should consider providing vouchers to individuals seeking drug treatment without access to it. Vouchers would open even more doors for treatment to those in our society who can least afford it.

I urge my colleagues to include these elements of the President's drug control strategy as part of a comprehensive antidrug bill this year. Mr. Speaker, it is time to end America's addiction to drugs.

THE SEASON FOR SANTA CLAUS IS OVER

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

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, the President, we are told, is about to play Santa Claus in the State of the Union Message. He will over tax relief to everyone in sight in the misguided belief that that will get our Nation out of its economic depression.

Most economists say he is dead wrong. What the country needs, they say, is a massive infusion of Federal money into our physical and social infrastructure. That will achieve a number of essential goals. It would put millions back to meaningful work. It would stop the drain on the Treasury for costly assistance programs. It would repair our crumbling roads, bridges, sewage facilities, transportation, housing, education, and health systems. And, finally, it would give us the only realistic possibility of reducing the deficit.

Let us face it: We cannot pennypinch ourselves out of a $3.7 trillion national debt that was amassed for the most part by the Reagan-Bush administrations.

Only by putting millions of unemployed Americans back to work can we both reduce the national debt and rebuild and reinvigorate America.

The season for Santa Claus is over, and as former President Nixon once said, "We are all Keynesians now."

NASA NEEDS TO WAKE UP

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago, NASA announced that it will begin setting up equipment this week in the Mojave Desert to look for space aliens. NASA will spend $100 million on this Star Trek-type project.

I think it is totally ridiculous that NASA would spend hard-earned taxpayer dollars in this way.

The Associated Press reported that there have been 50 similar projects, organized searches, since 1960, with nothing found so far.

The Congress has given NASA huge increases in recent years, over $5 billion in increases in just the last 5 years. If they are going to spend $100 million to try to find little green men in space, I think their budget should be cut.

Just think how many poor people could be helped with $100 million, or how much could be done for education.

The people at NASA need to wake up. They need to know that there is a recession going on with millions out of work. They surely do not need to take $100 million from American families to conduct a futile search for space aliens. I think it is just pitiful that they will arrogantly waste so much money in this way.

This project will help no one except for the bureaucrats at NASA.

INTRODUCTION OF JAPANESE TRADE RESOLUTION

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

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure you have followed the circus we are calling our trade policy with Japan. The President came back from Japan with promises that the Japanese would purchase $19 billion in auto parts and 20,000 cars. The President was scarcely back in the United States when we hear that those promises were in fact only targets. We found out that no guarantees could be made that those targets would be reached. And finally, to add insult to injury, the Speaker of the Japanese House told us that our workers were lazy and overpaid.

Well, the Speaker of the Japanese House obviously hasn't been to my district lately. Overpaid is probably the last word that comes to mind. The fact is, there are too many people looking for work, both in my district and across the country, to worry about being overpaid. Instead, they are worried about how they are going to feed their children and pay for their doctor's bills.

It is especially ironic that a Japanese official is making these claims because the Japanese are notorious for their unfair trade practices. They use import barriers to close other countries out of their markets while invading other markets with below cost products. Until now, we have allowed these practices, secure in the knowledge that our economy was a picture of health and vitality. Well, it doesn't take a genius to see that our economy is no longer so healthy. I believe our trade policies should reflect this change.

I will be introducing a resolution today which urges the President to get tough in negotiating with the Japanese. We can no longer rely on a smile and a handshake to produce open Japanese markets. Instead, we need to sit down and conduct tough negotiations in specific industries. This approach has worked in the past and will continue to work in the future if we take the initiative. It's time to stop exporting jobs and instead start taking care of our own.

HAIL TO THE REDSKINS—AGAIN

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate our beloved Washington Redskins on their 37-24 victory over the Buffalo Bills in Superbowl XXVI. This win was the perfect ending to a near-perfect season for the Washington area's hometown heroes.

In Sunday's game, as well as throughout the entire season, the team that featured a Mann, a Monk, and some Hogs displayed a tremendous amount of professionalism and sportsmanship. From coach "Golly Gee" Gibbs to MVP Mark Rypien, to "the Posse," the Redskins kept a low public profile and spent their time and energy preparing for their opponent.

After losing to the Dallas Cowboys in their 12th game, ending their hopes of finishing the regular season undefeated, the Redskins rebounded to finish the year with a record of 14-2, the best in the NFL. They breezed through the playoffs, and had little trouble finishing off the Bills—a formidable opponent—for their third title in 10 years under Coach Gibbs.

However, individual records have never been an important part of this team's makeup. Although players such as Rypien, wide receiver Gary Clark, tackle Jim Lachey, cornerback Darrell Green, and defensive end Charles Mann, to name a few, had superb seasons and are among the eight Redskins playing in the Pro Bowl. However, the team concept has always prevailed. The Redskins know that teams, not individuals, win championships, and it is a tribute to the coaching staff that these high-profile athletes are able to work together in reaching a common goal. No one epitomized this attitude more than long-time NFL veteran linebacker Matt Millen, who was placed on reserve—not eligible to participate—before the Super Bowl. Millen, a veteran of Super Bowls with two other teams did not complain when he was informed of his reserve status. Instead, he worked the sidelines during the game, rooting his teammates on to victory.

These are some of the reasons we cheer the Redskins week after week. Owner Jack Kent Cooke and Coach "Hey" Gibbs are quality individuals who surround themselves with outstanding players and coaches. Talent is crucial, but it must be molded into a smooth machine to win championships. With assistant coaches like "Torgy" Torgeson and Richie Petitbon, and with General Manager Charlie Casserly continuing to oversee operations, still another NFL championship is a very realistic possibility next year.

Let's all "Hail to the Redskins," and I look forward to seeing the Redskins next year in Pasadena for Super Bowl XXVII.

DO NOT SHIFT BURDEN BACK TO WORKING FAMILIES

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

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, it is our understanding that at the President's State of the Union Address this evening right here, he will be announcing that he is calling for the repeal of the luxury tax on yachts. Now he is arguing that by repealing this tax the boating industry will be invigorated, and more people will go back to work.

He will also argue that the yacht tax has not raised much revenue, if any, for the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it is hard to argue over either of those points, but I think it is only fair to recount the history of why we increased the luxury tax on yachts.

I take us back about 15 months to a debate that took place in this Chamber when the Democrats stood for the proposition that in order to reduce the budget deficit in this country, the wealthiest people in this country should pay a higher tax rate. We called at that time for a surtax on the income tax of millionaires, and the White House told us that was totally unacceptable; we could not impose this surtax on the income tax of millionaires. They came back with an alternative. The alternative was a luxury tax on the toys of the millionaires, on their yachts, their private airplanes, their jewelry, their expensive imported cars. So that was our compromise.

Tonight now, if the President is going to repeal the luxury tax on yachts and take what little burden might have existed on the wealthy off of them, I hope he does not shift that burden back to the working families of America. They have had too much of that under the Reagan-Bush economic theory.

RELEASE OF THE FOURTH NATIONAL DRUG CONTROL STRATEGY

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

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, as the Republican chairman of the House Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control, I welcome the fourth installment of the national drug control strategy, which updates America's comprehensive, coordinated, multiple-front battle plan on fighting and winning the war against drugs and I congratulate President Bush and drug czar Bob Martinez for their aggressive efforts to lead our Nation's struggle against narcotics.

I believe the Bush administration is entirely correct to focus our Nation's overall drug program on reducing the use of illegal substances through prevention, treatment and street level law enforcement; and to attack the supply of illicit narcotics through dismantling major drug organizations, both domestically and internationally, through seizing financial assets, destroying labs, airstrips and planes, and arresting the drug kingpins.

The administration has made a major funding commitment to the antidrug effort, increasing overall funding by 93 percent from $4.6 billion in 1988 to approximately $13 billion in fiscal year 1993. This figure includes $3.5 billion for State and local government drug control programs and a doubling of Federal treatment funds and prevention activities, since 1989.

But the figures that really count are those measuring consumption of drugs by American citizens. Since the administration took office, casual drug use has declined 13 percent. This continues an overall trend of decreased casual usage of 45 percent since 1985. The record is more mixed with hardcore use, which has increasingly become more of an inner-city, low-income, and minority-based problem. However, even in this group, use continues to decline among younger users. Thus for both casual users and hardcore addicts, the pipeline of those becoming involved in drugs continues to shrink. That means in future years, the problems associated with drugs, including crime and violence and drug addicted babies, hopefully will become more manageable.

Congress, although meeting the administration's overall budget request, has repeatedly failed to enact legislation that address very targeted fronts in our struggle against illicit substances. Specific legislation to require accountability in treatment and increase treatment capacity, H.R. 2810 for example, or to approve targeted education and treatment grants that would focus on the hardcore abuse problem, have languished in various committees and subcommittees for 3 years.

The Congress has also failed to enact air interdiction legislation proposed by the administration, which I introduced, which would make it a crime for a drug trafficking pilot to refuse a Coast Guard officer's order to land. This legislation is over 2 years old, and because of congressional inaction, our drug interdiction agencies are hampered in the performance of their duties because they do not have the necessary authority to carry out a full court press against the drug cartels.

Thus, some important progress has been made in the war against drugs. But we can and must do more. Now is not the time to give up; now is not the time to say we are on the wrong road; now is not the time to politicize the drug war with headline seeking press releases that are not based on the facts.

The fourth drug strategy points us in the right direction; and it is the manifestation of the leadership and commitment of this administration to end this scourge.

□ 1330

IT IS DISLOYAL AND TREASONOUS TO USE ILLEGAL SUBSTANCES

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

Mr. DORNAN of California. Mr. Speaker, in my 15-year tenure on Capitol Hill, with a break after the reapportionment of 1982, I have spent now 13 years on the Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control.

I want to associate myself with our excellent ranking minority member who just spoke and also congratulate the President for a 93-percent increase in just the 3 years he has been in office.

I want to congratulate Mr. Martinez, former Governor of Florida, who is doing an excellent job, and Bill Bennett, former Cabinet officer of Education who preceded him.

The one thing that Mr. Bennett and Mr. Martinez both say, and actually they are following the lead of our distinguished chairman here, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL], is that we are not going to surrender and cave in to screams from the far left and the far right that we are going to add to the alcohol problems of this country, alcohol abuse problems, legalization of every kind of narcotic substance across the board and then get the government in the business of controlling advertising, controlling the purity of certain drugs.

Now, $12.7 billion is a terrible chunk out of our big budget in this country to try and counter those Americans who do not realize in addition to personal self-destruction what a vicious act, an unpatriotic act it is, to rip their country apart and cause governments to be in danger of falling in Central and South America and people to die all up and down the line of the narcotics trafficking.

I went with the gentleman from New York [Mr. RANGEL] into Surinam. I went back myself to Ghana a few days later and to Trinidad to see the young American women who are used as mules and who are arrested on their very first trip from New York City and other cities, to see them rotting in jails in Jamaica and Trinidad, and that is a real tragedy. It is a disloyal, treasonous act to use illegal substances in this country, and let us get that clear.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE FLEET SHIP DISPOSAL ACT OF 1992

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3512) to direct

the Secretary of Transportation to dispose of certain vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3512

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "NDRF Ship Disposal Act of 1992".

SEC. 2. DISPOSAL OF NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE FLEET VESSELS.

(a) DISPOSAL REQUIREMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law (other than paragraph (3)) and before April 1, 1997, the Secretary of Transportation shall dispose of all vessels that are in the National Defense Reserve Fleet on the date of the enactment of this Act and that—

(A) are not assigned to the Ready Reserve Force component of that fleet; and

(B) are not specifically authorized or required by statute to be used for a particular purpose.

(2) NOTIFICATION OF SECRETARY OF THE NAVY.—The Secretary shall notify the Secretary of the Navy of the intent of the Secretary to dispose of a vessel under this section, by not later than 90 days before the date of that disposal.

(3) LIMITATIONS ON DISPOSAL REQUIREMENT.—

(A) RETENTION FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE PURPOSES.—The Secretary shall not dispose of a vessel under this section if the Secretary of the Navy certifies to the Secretary within 30 days after receiving notification of the intent of the Secretary to dispose of the vessel, that—

(i) the vessel is militarily useful, and

(ii) retention of the vessel in the National Defense Reserve Fleet is necessary for national defense purposes.

(B) USE BY STATE OR FEDERAL AGENCY.—The Secretary is authorized to not dispose of a vessel otherwise required to be disposed of under this section if the Secretary certifies to the Congress that the vessel is needed for use by a State or Federal governmental agency.

(C) RECERTIFICATION REQUIRED AFTER ONE YEAR.—Notwithstanding subparagraphs (A) and (B), the Secretary—

(i) may dispose of a vessel after the one-year period beginning on the date on which the Secretary of the Navy makes a certification described in subparagraph (A) with respect to the vessel, unless the Secretary of the Navy makes a subsequent certification under that subparagraph with respect to the vessel; and

(ii) shall dispose of a vessel after the one-year period beginning on the date the Secretary makes a certification described in subparagraph (B) with respect to the vessel, unless the Secretary makes a subsequent certification under that subparagraph with respect to the vessel.

(D) ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.—This section shall not be construed as superseding, or authorizing any activity prohibited by, the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(4) METHOD OF DISPOSAL.—Except as provided in subsection (c), the Secretary shall dispose of vessels pursuant to this section—

(A) in accordance with section 508 or 510(i) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1158, 1160(i)); and

(B) in the case of vessels disposed of after 3 months after the effective date of this section, in accordance with the plan submitted by the Secretary under subsection (b).

(b) VESSEL DISPOSAL PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall submit to the Congress a plan for disposing of vessels pursuant to this section, by not later than 3 months after the effective date of this section.

(2) CONTENTS.—The plan submitted under this subsection shall include—

(A) procedures to be followed in disposing of vessels, including procedures for notifying the Secretary of the Navy pursuant to subsection (a)(2);

(B) standards developed by the Secretary for—

(i) identifying vessels to be disposed of,

(ii) establishing the priority for disposing of each vessel so identified, and

(iii) making certifications under subsection (a)(3)(B);

(C) standards developed by the Secretary of the Navy for making certifications under subsection (a)(3)(A); and

(D) a preliminary schedule for vessel disposals which indicates the number of vessels, or percentage of the total number of vessels required to be disposed of, that will be disposed of each year.

(c) USE OF VESSELS FOR ARTIFICIAL REEF PROGRAM.—

(1) SELECTION BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary may select not more than 15 of the vessels required to be disposed of under this section, for transfer to States for establishing artificial reefs.

(2) APPLICATION AND USE BY STATE.—A State may apply to the Secretary for a vessel selected under paragraph (1), for use—

(A) as an artificial reef in accordance with the Act entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1973 for certain programs of the Department of Commerce and for other purposes", approved August 22, 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1220 et seq., hereinafter in this subsection referred to as the "Artificial Reef Act"); or

(B) for exchanging for another vessel to be used by the State for an artificial reef in accordance with this subsection.

(3) REQUIREMENT TO TRANSFER.—The Secretary shall transfer a vessel selected under paragraph (1) to a State which fulfills the requirements for that transfer under the Artificial Reef Act with respect to the vessel (or another vessel to be acquired by exchange under this subsection).

(4) VESSEL EXCHANGES.—

(A) APPROVAL REQUIRED.—A State may not exchange a vessel acquired (or to be acquired) under this subsection from the Secretary for another vessel unless that exchange is approved by the Secretary. The Secretary may not approve any such exchange before the effective date of regulations issued by the Secretary under subparagraph (B).

(B) TERMS AND CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL.—The Secretary shall, by not later than 120 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, issue regulations which establish such terms and conditions for vessel exchanges under this subsection as the Secretary considers appropriate to—

(i) protect the interests of the United States, including requirements for undertakings with sureties under subparagraph (D); and

(ii) ensure that the use by a State for an artificial reef of a vessel acquired by the State through that exchange shall comply with the requirements applicable to use of obsolete ships for that purpose under the Artificial Reef Act.

(C) TREATMENT OF VESSELS ACQUIRED BY STATES BY EXCHANGE.—For purposes of this subsection and the Artificial Reef Act, a vessel acquired (or to be acquired) by a State by exchange under paragraph (2)(B) shall be treated as an obsolete ship.

(D) USE OF VESSEL EXCHANGED BY STATE.—A person that acquires a vessel from a State through an exchange under this subsection shall—

(i) scrap that vessel by not later than 6 months after the date of the exchange; and

(ii) enter into an undertaking with sureties, approved by the Secretary, to ensure that scrapping is carried out.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(1) NATIONAL DEFENSE RESERVE FLEET.—The term "National Defense Reserve Fleet" means that fleet maintained under section 11 of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946 (50 App. U.S.C. 1744).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Transportation.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on April 1, 1992.

SEC. 3. TECHNICAL CORRECTION.

(a) CORRECTION.—Section 11(b) of the Merchant Ship Sales Act of 1946, as amended by section 6 of the Act of October 13, 1989 (Public Law 101-115, commonly referred to as the "Maritime Administration Authorization Act of 1990"), is amended to read as if it had not been repealed by section 307(12) of the Coast Guard Authorization Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-225).

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall be effective December 12, 1989.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3512 is the National Defense Reserve Fleet Ship Disposal Act of 1991. It was introduced by Congressmen BROOMFIELD, WYDEN, DAVIS, LENT, and me on October 8, 1991. It directs the Secretary of Transportation to dispose of all vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet before January 1, 1997—unless they are assigned to the Ready Reserve Force component of that fleet, or are specifically authorized by statute to be used for a particular purpose.

This bill sets in place a plan and schedule to scrap those vessels that are no longer militarily useful, and provides a workable framework for the disposal of the obsolete components of the National Defense Reserve Fleet. The proceeds received for these vessels will be applied by the Maritime Administration to upgrade vessels for the Ready Reserve Force. H.R. 3512 is the product of two hearings and the recommendations of a General Accounting Office study of the fleet, and it has the support of the Department of Transportation.

When we filed the report on H.R. 3512, the cost estimate of the Congressional

Budget Office was not available. It is here now, and I would like to insert it in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 15, 1992.

Hon. WALTER B. JONES,
Chairman, Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed H.R. 3512, the NDRF Ship Disposal Act of 1991, as reported by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on January 3, 1992. The bill would affect direct spending and thus would be subject to pay-as-you-go procedures under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. As a result, the estimate required under clause 8 of House Rule XXI also is attached. We estimate that any budgetary impact of H.R. 3512 would be negligible.

H.R. 3512 would require the Secretary of Transportation to dispose of certain vessels in the National Defense Reserve Fleet (NDRF) by January 1, 1997. Exempt from this requirement would be all ships within the Ready Reserve Force (RRF) component of the fleet as well as certain vessels deemed to be useful for military or other authorized purposes. Disposal of the ships would be governed by title V of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 (relating to the sale of obsolete vessels for scrap) and would be carried out under a plan to be developed by the Maritime Administration (MARAD), which manages the NDRF on behalf of the U.S. Navy. Up to fifteen of the vessels may be transferred to qualified states for artificial reefs, as authorized by Public Law 92-402.

Presently there are about 135 ships in the NDRF that are not in the Ready Reserve Force, including 20-25 vessels of sufficient value to be upgraded to the RRF, used by other federal agencies, or made available to states for maritime training. Most of the remaining ships (including about 20 already on the inactive retention list) are in poor condition and will probably be scrapped under MARAD's existing ship disposal program. Initiated last year, this program calls for a phased reduction of the existing non-RRF fleet over the 1991-2000 period, mostly through direct sales on world scrap markets. (Some vessels would be donated to nonprofit organizations or used as artificial reefs.) Under existing law, the proceeds from the sale of obsolete vessels will be deposited in the Vessel Operations Revolving Fund, from which they will be available without further appropriation for the purposes of acquiring new NDRF vessels.

Based on information obtained from MARAD, CBO does not expect the enactment of H.R. 3512 to have any significant impact on the agency's program or budget. Because many of the provisions of H.R. 3512 reflect current Administration practices (including those regarding conveyance to states for artificial reefs), it appears that the same number of vessels would be disposed of under both the existing and mandated ship disposal programs. While it is possible that, under the bill's accelerated disposal schedule, some proceeds from scrap sales may be realized earlier, most or all of the change would probably be matched by faster spending on new vessels for the NDRF. Moreover, any savings on maintenance costs from the earlier disposal of existing NDRF vessels would be at least partially offset by additional expenses associated with new acquisitions.

Enactment of this legislation would have no impact on the budgets of state or local governments.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Deborah Reis, who can be reached at 226-2860.

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE [1]

The applicable cost estimate of this act for all purposes of sections 252 and 253 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be as follows:

[By fiscal year, in millions of dollars]

	1992	1993	1994	1995
Change in outlays	$0	$0	$0	$0
Change in receipts	NA	NA	NA	NA

Mr. Speaker, the bill presented incorporates several minor amendments from the original bill. It changes the effective date to April 1, 1992; provides more flexibility regarding the acquisition of obsolete vessels for artificial reefs; and makes a technical correction regarding the administration of the National Defense Reserve Fleet.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me compliment the original sponsor of this legislation, our colleague from Michigan, Mr. BROOMFIELD. He has done a fine job of identifying a problem, looking into it thoroughly, and working with my committee to produce an effective solution. He and Mr. WYDEN from Oregon deserve credit for their roles in this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend Chairman JONES for his able leadership throughout the consideration of H.R. 3512.

First, I want to make sure that everyone recognizes that this vessel disposal program being set up by H.R. 3512 involves the 116 vessels in the non-RRF portion of the National Defense Reserve Fleet. The overwhelming bulk of these vessels are over 45 years old and their usefulness has been severely questioned.

The subcommittee has held extensive hearings on the specific issue of what to do with the older NDRF ships. In addition, the committee received a GAO report on this same issue. While the GAO report concludes that most, if not all, of the NDRF vessels could be activated during a period of national emergency, these vessels are old, slow, difficult to crew, and incapable of carrying large amounts of cargo, and therefore are no longer needed as sealift assets.

The bill, which replaces H.R. 265 and sets up a disposal regime for the NDRF—non-RRF—ships, allows the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Transportation to retain those vessels which should be retained for governmental uses. MarAd will prepare a plan for disposing of the NDRF ships that have not been assigned to the RRF; set aside by statute for a particular purpose or reserved for use by a State or Federal agency; or identified by the Navy as militarily useful vessels needed for the national defense, by January 1, 1997. The Navy must recertify annually any ships it wants retained.

This legislation gives the administration the latitude it needs to manage this disposal properly in a timely fashion.

It also sets aside 15 of these ships for possible donation to States for use as artificial fish reef. I want to thank Chairman JONES and the committee for including a provision which will facilitate the acquisition of vessels for the creation of artificial reefs in Great Lakes waters.

Finally I want to commend a fellow Member of the Michigan delegation and my close friend BILL BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, without his persistence and diligence, we would not yet be to first base. Instead, largely because of BILL BROOMFIELD, we now have a real opportunity to correct a Federal program that seemed to have lost sight of its objective. Not only are we refocused, but we may even be able to save the Government some money.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. WYDEN].

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join in the praise for Chairman JONES who has shepherded this legislation and has been most gracious in all his efforts to help us work out this legislation.

I also want to commend our colleague, the ranking minority member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] as well, because this is truly a bipartisan bill.

I want to follow up on what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] has said about the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD]. The fact of the matter is that this legislation is out here today because the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] has bulldogged this issue for years and years, saying that this was a question of fairness for the taxpayers and for our national security. I want to join the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] in saluting the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] who has made it possible for this legislation to be out here on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is we are dealing with 116 vessels, virtually all of them that are older than I am. What we have is a set of cadavers that have long outlived their usefulness. It is time to scrap them and use those scarce dollars to build up a modern sealift capability.

Perhaps the most telling comment about these 116 vessels is that during

[1] An estimate of H.R. 3512 as reported by the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries on January 3, 1992. This estimate was transmitted by the Congressional Budget Office on January 15, 1992.

the Persian Gulf war, rather than being able to rely on our own vessels and these ships, we were involved in a rent-a-ship program where we had to go out and lease foreign vessels, and not one of these ships that we are talking about here today was in a position to be reactivated and help to promote our national security during the Persian Gulf conflict.

So this legislation in my view is long overdue.

I must tell our colleagues that during a time when resources are scarce, the essence of our national security must involve a modern capability that can move around the world quickly. These ships are not in any position to play a role in that kind of national security service.

So I join in our bipartisan efforts today and again commend Chairman JONES and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] and particularly the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD]. Through our investigations in the subcommittee we were able to join Chairman JONES in this effort, and I want to thank my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this important piece of legislation. Before I begin my remarks, I just want to thank, and congratulate, two senior Members of this body—Chairman JONES and my honorable colleague from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD].

Mr. BROOMFIELD was the first to raise the alarm about waste and mismanagement in the maintenance of these inordinately expensive, and obviously unnecessary maritime cadavers within the National Defense Reserve Fleet. It was his doggedness and energy in the pursuit of saving the taxpayers' dollars that resulted in a hearing before my Small Business Subcommittee 2 years ago on this matter. Suffice it to say that we found gaping holes in the Maritime Administration's arguments for preserving that fleet. To its credit, the Maritime Administration has abandoned its earlier, untenable position and now supports this bill. I congratulate them for seeing the light.

Mr. BROOMFIELD is, of course, the primary author of the legislation before us, today, which liquidates this fleet in a timely, and cost-effective manner—one which will save millions of those hard-earned tax dollars.

Mr. JONES shepherded this bill through the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and now brings this legislation to the floor. His leadership has been painstaking, and the benefits will be felt by taxpayers across-the-board.

The object of this bill is approximately 116 Government-owned cargo vessels within the NDRF. Most of these ships are of World War II vintage—Victory ships. They are old, small, and slow-moving. For many, crews would have to be retrained to use near-extinct technology in order to activate these ships in the case of a national emergency.

That is, if they could be reactivated. A general Accounting Office report done at our behest indicated that many of these ships had been poorly maintained, and that in many cases key spare parts were nowhere to be found. Those problems obviously lead the Government to go the rent-a-ship route during the Persian Gulf war, when not one of these ships was reactivated, and yet scores of foreign flag vessels were leased to carry our war material and supplies.

To me, the gulf sealift was the litmus test for this oldest, but not boldest, portion of the NDRF. These 116 ships serve no earthly purpose under any conflict scenario. They are moored in places like Fort Eustis, VA; San Francisco, CA, and Beaumont, TX, soaking up about $10 million per year in ill-spent maintenance costs, and denying us an estimated $40 million in liquidated value.

There is no reason to continue this fleet. The aging ships lost their strategic value years ago. Let's do now what should have been done in an earlier Congress and begin liquidating these ships in a reasonable and efficient manner.

If I may address one more item, the amendment to be offered on the floor, today, allowing for the conditional exchange of some ships within the fleet for non-NDRF vessels seems to be an extremely reasonable and beneficial idea, and one which will benefit the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment, and the legislation, and I again thank Mr. JONES and Mr. BROOMFIELD for the strong leadership they've demonstrated on this important issue.

□ 1340

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BROOMFIELD] the principal author of this legislation.

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, this is a most appropriate time to bring this bill to the floor. Last month, we commemorated the 50th anniversary of the beginning of America's participation in World War II.

The ships we are discussing here today are veterans of that war. They fought the good fight. They served America well, and now it's time to muster them out with full honors.

I would like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman JONES of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, as well as its ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan, BOB DAVIS. I would also like to thank the gentleman from New York NORMAN LENT, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, for their work in bringing this bill to the floor. Special thanks also to the gentleman from Oregon RON WYDEN, for his help in focusing attention on this important issue in the Small Business Committee.

Also, great credit should go to Paul Russinoff, a former member of my staff, and to Terri Hauser, Karen Block, and Tim Lanigan of my present staff and to Rusty Johnston and Mark Rugge of the Merchant Marine Committee staff.

Some of my fellow Members might wonder why BILL BROOMFIELD, a Member normally associated with the Foreign Affairs Committee, has sponsored this bill and taken such an interest in seeing it become law.

My interest in the so-called ghost fleet stems from a call I got from an old friend, the late Bill Donaldson, the former mayor of Pontiac, MI. Bill told me about a number of World War II—era vessels that were being used for naval target practice and others that were being sunk as artificial reefs.

What concerned Bill was the sight of these ships being sent to the bottom of the ocean loaded down with a treasure chest of expensive equipment.

America's do-it-yourselfer, who spends his Saturday mornings at the hardware store, would not believe what was being thrown away: motors, band saws, lathes and vises, rotary pumps, and radar equipment were just some of the items.

What neither Bill nor I could understand is why these ships were being sunk with millions of dollars of this equipment on board. In an era when American taxpayers are being forced to cut back on the family budgets, there is no reason why Uncle Sam should be so wasteful with his.

I decided to look into the matter for myself, so I flew down to take a look at the ships that are part of the James River fleet.

What I found amazed me. Anyone who has driven by a farmhouse, and seen an old rusty hulk of a 1940 Hudson or Nash sitting up on blocks, can visualize what much of this reserve fleet looks like.

Grass is growing on the decks of some of these ships, paint is peeling off the hulls, and rusting materials and equipment lie everywhere.

Many of the brave men and women who served in our Armed Forces 50 years ago would be amazed—and depressed—at the sight of these ships.

Americans don't drive 50-year-old cars anymore, and I cannot imagine we are going to win any battles in 50-year-old ships. As I looked this fleet over, I began to wonder why we were keeping many of these ships at all.

That lesson was driven home to me at the start of the war against Iraq. Operation Desert Shield provided about as good a test case of these ships as anyone is likely to devise. Not one of them was used. And for a good reason. Not one of them would have made it across the ocean in time to supply our troops.

In fact, fewer than half of the ships in the more up-to-date Ready Reserve were called up for service in the Persian Gulf conflict, and only 14 of the 41 that were used made it to the gulf on time.

One senior Army official put it best: "The Ready Reserve," he said, "ain't ready."

If the Ready Reserve was late on arrival, the 100 or so ships in the World War II-era ghost fleet would have been dead on arrival. No military commander in his right mind would rely on these old World War II ships to get the goods to his troops.

For years the ghost fleet has been weathering the elements, gathering rust and costing the taxpayers millions of dollars. If ever there was a case for mercy killing, this is it.

While I favor a mustering out of the ghost fleet, let me say that I continue to be an outspoken advocate of a strong defense. Our sealift capacity is an important part of our military strength. I am definitely on the side of rebuilding our Nation's Merchant Marine.

But I do oppose wasting the taxpayer's money to maintain ships that cannot possibly serve when needed. Roughly half of the ships in our mothballed fleet were built in the World War II era.

The bill directs the Secretary of Transportation to dispose of all vessels that are in the National Defense Reserve Fleet that are not assigned to the Ready Reserve Force component of that fleet.

Specifically, the bill sets an up-or-out policy. A vessel must be upgraded to Ready Reserve Force status or it must be scrapped. An exception will be made if the Secretary of Defense states that a particular ship must be kept for national security reasons.

Proceeds from the sale of useless vessels will be used to make sure that the Ready Reserve Force is truly ready for the Nation's next emergency.

Disposing of the old wounded warriors will weed out our inventory of unusable vessels so that we can focus our efforts on the real deficiencies in our sealift capacity.

So I do not consider this bill merely a matter of sounding taps for a fleet from the past; I also consider it a matter of sounding reveille for a fleet of the future.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this important legislation.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in support of H.R. 3512, the NDRF Ship Disposal Act of 1991.

The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee has worked on this legislation for the last couple of years to determine the best procedure for disposal of the older vessels being held in the National Defense Reserve Fleet [NDRF]. Currently, the NDRF is composed of 212 vessels, including 96 in the Ready Reserve Force [RRF] and, of course this legislation would not affect the RRF vessels. There are 71 victory class ships and 45 other older vessels in the non-RRF portion of the NDRF. It is these ships that we are talking about today.

After studying the excellent report that the committee received from the General Accounting Office, it appears that this legislation achieves the rational approach to the disposal of these older ships that we have been looking for. H.R. 3512 will allow the Federal Government, through the Secretary of Transportation and the Secretary of the Navy to make decisions on which ships should be retained and which ships should be scrapped.

The bill also would prevent the scrapping of any vessels that are assigned for use by either a Federal or State agency. So, if the Corps of Engineers or one of the State maritime academies are using ships that are officially considered to be in the NDRF, those ships will be retained until no longer needed. The Maritime Administration [Marad] will use its existing statutory authority to scrap those ships which are not needed and the agency can use either foreign or domestic scrapping companies for this purpose. The bill also sets aside 15 NDRF ships for possible donation to coastal States for use as artificial fish reefs.

After discussions with the original cosponsors of this legislation—Messrs. BROOMFIELD and WYDEN—and representatives from Marad, we have crafted a bill that meets everyone's objectives. I understand that the administration is prepared to sign this bill in its current form. It represents a sound economic approach to the disposal of these old ships and will provide the Government with funds to acquire additional ships that ultimately could be upgraded to RRF status. At the same time it will protect our national defense shipping needs by preserving those ships that might still be militarily useful.

I want to specifically thank our committee chairman, WALTER JONES, and our ranking member, BOB DAVIS, for their help in moving this bill through the committee. Also, it is a pleasure to acknowledge the hard work and perseverance of Congressman BILL BROOMFIELD—the original sponsor of this legislation—and Congressman RON WYDEN who worked with us in the development of this program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of our House colleagues to join with us in supporting this bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3512, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

FLOWER GARDEN BANKS MARINE SANCTUARY DESIGNATION

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 3866) to provide for the designation of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I—NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

FLOWER GARDEN BANKS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

SECTION 101. Notwithstanding section 304(b) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1434(b))—

(1) the Secretary of Commerce shall, on January 17, 1992 (or as soon thereafter as is practicable), publish under that Act in the Federal Register a notice of designation of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary, as described in the notice of designation submitted to the Congress on November 20, 1991; and

(2) that designation shall take effect on January 17, 1992.

TITLE II—MERCHANT MARINE PROVISIONS

NON-VESSEL-OPERATING COMMON CARRIERS

SEC. 201. (a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the "Non-Vessel-Operating Common Carrier Act of 1991".

(b) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Section 10(b) of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. App. 1709(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (14), by inserting ", insurance, or other surety" after "bond"; and

(2) in paragraph (15), by inserting ", insurance, or other surety" after "bond".

(c) SURETY FOR NVOCC'S.—Section 23 of the Shipping Act of 1984 (46 U.S.C. App. 1721), is amended—

*(1) in the section heading by striking "**bonding of**" and inserting in lieu thereof "**surety for**";*

(2) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

"(a) SURETY.—Each non-vessel-operating common carrier shall furnish to the Commission a bond, proof of insurance, or such other surety, as the Commission may require, in a form and an amount determined by the Commission to be satisfactory to insure the financial responsibility of that carrier. Any bond submitted pursuant to this section shall be issued by a surety company found acceptable by the Secretary of the Treasury.";

(3) by striking subsection (b) and redesignating subsections (c) through (e) as subsections (b) through (d), respectively;

(4) in subsection (b), as so redesignated—

(A) by striking "BOND" in the subsection heading and inserting in lieu thereof "SURETY";

(B) by inserting ", insurance, or other surety" after "bond"; and

(C) by inserting "under this Act" after "transportation-related activities"; and

(5) in subsection (d), as so redesignated—

(A) by inserting ", insurance, or other surety" after "bond"; and

(B) by striking "subsection (d)" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (c)".

(d) INTERIM RULES AND REGULATIONS.—The Federal Maritime Commission may prescribe interim rules and regulations necessary to carry out the amendments made by this section.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 23 in the table of contents in the first section of the Shipping Act of 1984 is amended by striking "Bonding of" and inserting in lieu thereof "Surety for".

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall become effective 90 days after the date of its enactment.

CLARIFICATIONS OF, AND LIMITATIONS ON, GAMBLING DEVICES PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 202. (a) TRANSPORT TO A PLACE IN A STATE, ETC.—Section 2 of the Act of January 2,

1951 (15 U.S.C. 1172; commonly referred to as the "Johnson Act"), is amended—

(1) by inserting before the first paragraph the following: "(a) GENERAL RULE.—";

(2) in subsection (a) (as so designated) by striking ", District of Columbia,";

(3) by inserting before the second paragraph the following: "(b) AUTHORITY OF FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION.—"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(c) EXCEPTION.—This section does not prohibit the transport of a gambling device to a place in a State or a possession of the United States on a vessel on a voyage, if—

"(1) use of the gambling device on a portion of that voyage is, by reason of subsection (b) of section 5, not a violation of that section; and

"(2) the gambling device remains on board that vessel while in that State.".

(b) REPAIR, OTHER TRANSPORT, ETC.—Section 5 of that Act (15 U.S.C. 1175) is amended—

(1) by inserting before "It shall be unlawful" the following: "(a) GENERAL RULE.—";

(2) by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", including on a vessel documented under chapter 121 of title 46, United States Code, or documented under the laws of a foreign country"; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) EXCEPTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), this section does not prohibit—

"(A) the repair, transport, possession, or use of a gambling device on a vessel that is not within the boundaries of any State or possession of the United States; or

"(B) the transport or possession, on a voyage, of a gambling device on a vessel that is within the boundaries of any State or possession of the United States, if—

"(i) use of the gambling device on a portion of that voyage is, by reason of subparagraph (A), not a violation of this section; and

"(ii) the gambling device remains on board that vessel while the vessel is within the boundaries of that State or possession.

"(2) APPLICATION TO CERTAIN VOYAGES.—

"(A) GENERAL RULE.—Paragraph (1)(A) does not apply to the repair or use of a gambling device on a vessel that is on a voyage or segment of a voyage described in subparagraph (B) of this paragraph if the State or possession of the United States in which the voyage or segment begins and ends has enacted a statute, the terms of which prohibit that repair or use on that voyage or segment.

"(B) VOYAGE AND SEGMENT DESCRIBED.—A voyage or segment of a voyage referred to in subparagraph (A) is a voyage or segment, respectively—

"(i) that begins and ends in the same State or possession of the United States, and

"(ii) during which the vessel does not make an intervening stop within the boundaries of another State or possession of the United States or a foreign country.".

(c) BOUNDARIES DEFINED.—The first section of that Act (15 U.S.C. 1171) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) The term "boundaries" has the same meaning given that term in section 2 of the Submerged Lands Act.".

TITLE III—IMPLEMENTATION OF MARITIME BOUNDARY AGREEMENT AMENDMENTS TO MAGNUSON FISHERY CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT ACT

SEC. 301. (a) PURPOSES.—Section 2(b)(1) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1801(b)(1)) is amended by inserting ", and fishery resources in the special areas" immediately before the semicolon at the end.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (24) through (32) as paragraphs (25) through (33), respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately after paragraph (23) the following new paragraph:

"(24) The term 'special areas' means the areas referred to as eastern special areas in Article 3(1) of the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1, 1990; in particular, the term refers to those areas east of the United States-Soviet maritime boundary, as defined in that Agreement, that lie within 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the Soviet Union is measured but beyond 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the United States is measured.".

(c) UNITED STATES MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY.—(1) Section 101(a) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1811(a)) is amended by inserting "and special areas" immediately before the period at the end.

(2) Section 101(b) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1811(b)) is amended by inserting immediately after paragraph (2) the following new paragraph:

"(3) All fishery resources in the special areas.".

(d) FOREIGN FISHING.—Section 201 of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1821) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting "within the special areas," immediately before "or for anadromous species"; and

(B) by striking "beyond the exclusive economic zone" and inserting in lieu thereof "beyond such zone or areas";

(2) in subsection (e)(1)(E)(IV), by inserting "or special areas" immediately after "exclusive economic zone";

(3) in subsection (i)—

(A) by inserting "or special areas" immediately before the period at the end of paragraph (1)(A);

(B) by inserting "or special areas" immediately after "exclusive economic zone" in paragraph (2)(A); and

(C) by inserting "or special areas" immediately after "exclusive economic zone" in paragraph (2)(B); and

(4) in subsection (j)—

(A) by inserting ", special areas," immediately after "exclusive economic zone"; and

(B) by inserting ", areas," immediately after "such zone".

(e) INTERNATIONAL FISHERY AGREEMENTS.—Section 202 of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1822) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting "or special areas" immediately after "February 28, 1977)"; and

(B) by striking "such zone or area" and inserting in lieu thereof "such zone or areas";

(2) in subsection (c)—

(A) by inserting "or special areas" immediately after "February 28, 1977)"; and

(B) by striking "such zone or area" and inserting in lieu thereof "such zone or areas"; and

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

"(g) FISHERY AGREEMENT WITH UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS.—(1) The Secretary of State, in consultation with the Secretary, is authorized to negotiate and conclude a fishery agreement with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics of a duration of no more than 3 years, pursuant to which—

"(A) the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will give United States fishing vessels the opportunity to conduct traditional fisheries within waters claimed by the United States prior to the conclusion of the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1, 1990, west of the maritime boundary, including the western special area described in Article 3(2) of the Agreement;

"(B) the United States will give fishing vessels of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the opportunity to conduct traditional fisheries within waters claimed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics prior to the conclusion of the Agreement referred to in subparagraph (A), east of the maritime boundary, including the eastern special areas described in Article 3(1) of the Agreement;

"(C) catch data shall be made available to the government of the country exercising fisheries jurisdiction over the waters in which the catch occurred; and

"(D) each country shall have the right to place observers on board vessels of the other country and to board and inspect such vessels.

"(2) Vessels operating under a fishery agreement negotiated and concluded pursuant to paragraph (1) shall be subject to regulations and permit requirements of the country in whose waters the fisheries are conducted only to the extent such regulations and permit requirements are specified in that agreement.

"(3) The Secretary of Commerce may promulgate such regulations, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of any fishery agreement negotiated and concluded pursuant to paragraph (1).".

(f) PERMITS FOR FOREIGN FISHING.—Section 204(a) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1824(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "within the special areas," immediately before "or for anadromous species"; and

(2) by inserting "or areas" immediately after "such zone".

(g) CONTENTS OF FISHERY MANAGEMENT PLANS.—Section 303(b)(1)(A) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1853(b)(1)(A)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "or special areas," immediately after "exclusive economic zone"; and

(2) by inserting "or areas" immediately after "such zone".

(h) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Section 307 of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1857) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)(K), by inserting "or special areas" immediately after "exclusive economic zone";

(2) in paragraph (2)(B)—

(A) by inserting "within the special areas," immediately after "exclusive economic zone";

(B) by inserting "or areas" immediately after "such zone";

(3) in paragraph (3), by inserting "or special areas" immediately after "exclusive economic zone"; and

(4) in paragraph (4), by inserting "or special areas" immediately after "exclusive economic zone".

(i) ENFORCEMENT.—Section 311(b)(2) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1861(b)(2)) is amended by inserting "and special areas" immediately after "exclusive economic zone".

AMENDMENTS TO NORTHERN PACIFIC HALIBUT ACT OF 1982

SEC. 302. (a) DEFINITIONS.—(1) Section 2(c) of the Northern Pacific Halibut Act of 1982 (16 U.S.C. 773(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) 'Exclusive economic zone' means the zone established by Proclamation Numbered 5030, dated March 10, 1983. For purposes of applying

this Act, the inner boundary of that zone is a line coterminous with the seaward boundary of each of the coastal States.".

(2) Section 2 of the Northern Pacific Halibut Act of 1982 (16 U.S.C. 773) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(h) 'Special areas' means the areas referred to as eastern special areas in Article 3(1) of the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1. 1990; in particular, the term refers to those areas east of the United States-Soviet maritime boundary, as defined in that Agreement, that lie within 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the Soviet Union is measured but beyond 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the United States is measured.".

(b) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—Section 7(b) of the Northern Pacific Halibut Act of 1982 (16 U.S.C. 773e(b)) is amended by striking "fishery conservation zone" and inserting in lieu thereof "exclusive economic zone and special areas".

AMENDMENTS TO THE FUR SEAL ACT OF 1966

SEC. 303. Section 101 of the Fur Seal Act of 1966 (16 U.S.C. 1151) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (f) through (m) as subsections (g) through (n), respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately after subsection (e) the following new subsection:

"(f) 'Jurisdiction of the United States' includes jurisdiction over the special areas defined in section 3(24) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(24)).".

AMENDMENTS TO MARINE MAMMAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1972

SEC. 304. Section 3(14) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1362(14)) is amended to read as follows:

"(14) The term 'waters under the jurisdiction of the United States' means—

"(A) the territorial sea of the United States;

"(B) the waters included within a zone, contiguous to the territorial sea of the United States, of which the inner boundary is a line coterminous with the seaward boundary of each coastal State, and the outer boundary is a line drawn in such a manner that each point on it is 200 nautical miles from the baseline from which the territorial sea is measured; and

"(C) the areas referred to as eastern special areas in Article 3(1) of the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1, 1990; in particular, those areas east of the United States-Soviet Maritime boundary, as defined in that Agreement, that lie within 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the Soviet Union is measured but beyond 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the United States is measured.".

RELATIONSHIP TO ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973

SEC. 305. The special areas defined in section 3(24) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1802(24)) shall be considered places that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for the purposes of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

AMENDMENTS TO PACIFIC SALMON TREATY ACT OF 1985

SEC. 306. (a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2 of the Pacific Salmon Treaty Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3631) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsections (h) through (j) as subsections (i) through (k), respectively; and

(2) by inserting immediately after subsection (g) the following new subsection:

"(h) 'Special areas' means the areas referred to as eastern special areas in Article 3(1) of the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1, 1990; in particular, the term refers to those areas east of the United States-Soviet maritime boundary, as defined in that Agreement, that lie within 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the Soviet Union is measured but beyond 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the United States is measured.".

(b) RULEMAKING.—Section 7(a) of the Pacific Salmon Treaty Act of 1985 (16 U.S.C. 3636(a) is amended by inserting "and special areas" immediately after "Exclusive Economic Zone".

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM

SEC. 307. (a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 303(6) of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1122(6)) is amended—

(1) by striking "and" at the end of subparagraph (E);

(2) by redesignating subparagraph (F) as subparagraph (G); and

(3) by inserting immediately after subparagraph (E) the following new subparagraph:

"(F) the special areas defined in section 3(24) of the Magnuson Fishery Conservation and Management Act (18 U.S.C. 1802(24)); and".

(b) INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM.—Section 3(a)(6) of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 1124a(a)(6)) is amended by inserting "and special areas" immediately after "exclusive economic zone".

EFFECTIVE DATES

SEC. 208. (a) IN GENERAL.—The amendment made by section 201(e)(3) takes effect on the date of enactment of this Act, and the amendments made by the other provisions of this title, except as provided in subsection (b), shall be effective on the date on which the Agreement between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1, 1990, enters into force for the United States.

(b) AUTHORITY TO PRESCRIBE REGULATIONS.—The authority to prescribe regulations to implement the amendments made by this title shall be effective on the date of enactment of this Act, but no such regulation may be effective until the date on which the Agreement described in subsection (a) enters into force for the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill carries a Senate amendment composed of four separate provisions—two of which are House bills that were passed in the closing days of the first session.

The first title contains the designation of the Flower Garden Banks Marine Sanctuary—a bill that the House passed under suspension on November 23, 1991. This designation has been requested by the administration.

Another title is the U.S.-Flag Cruise Ship Competitiveness Act which also passed under suspension on November 23, 1991.

This will permit U.S.-flag cruise vessels to offer gambling to their passengers when embarked on cruises on the high seas.

We had a lengthy discussion on the floor about this on November 23, 1991. I simply want the Members to understand that this will enable our U.S. vessels to operate on a level playing field with foreign flag cruise ships with respect to gambling.

In addition, we are accepting an amendment to Public Law 101-595, the statute imposing a bonding requirement on nonvessel-operating common carriers. The purpose of this statute is to ensure the financial protection of shippers and others who deal with NVOCC's and to ensure that NVOCC's comply with all the applicable requirements of the 1984 Shipping Act.

Enactment of Public Law 101-595 was greeted by predictions of financial hardship by certain NVOCC's, mainly ones which happen to be foreign-based companies. We were told that bonds would not be available, that the cost of a bond would be exorbitant, or that foreign commerce would be disrupted. As it turned out, of course, none of these predictions came true. In fact, bonds are readily obtainable, and I understand that a $50,000 bond can frequently be secured for $500 or less.

Nonetheless, there is merit to giving the Federal Maritime Commission more flexibility in the manner by which it makes sure that NVOCC's are financially responsible. These amendments allow that flexibility.

Of course, the fact that Congress is granting the Commission the authority to allow methods for financial security other than bonds does not mean that Congress is requiring changes in the present regulatory structure. The current rules are an effective way of ensuring financial responsibility by NVOCC's; if the FMC chooses to allow alternative methods, it must be careful to make sure that American shippers are afforded no less protection than provided by a bond. Also, the Commission should consider whether an alternative methods might impose added legal burdens on a claimant seeking to ensure a judgment against a NVOCC; alternative methods should be no more procedurally cumbersome for injured claimants than bonds are.

The Commission has a history of making sure that certain maritime industries show financial responsibly to protect their customers; for example, passenger vessels must demonstrate evidence of financial responsibility. The Commission should implement these new amendments taking full advantage of its experience in this area.

In summary, Congress expects that the FMC will make sure that NVOCC's demonstrate financial responsibility in ways that provide no less protection than exists of American shippers today.

Finally, this bill amends various fisheries laws to take into account the United States-Soviet Maritime Boundary Agreement that was signed on June 1, 1990.

Because of ensuing events in what was formerly the Soviet Union, I will offer a technical corrections resolution immediately after we dispose of this bill.

The resolution will simply substitute the word "Russia" for the U.S.S.R. in a number of provisions, and make a few other purely technical changes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3866 provides, in title I, for the designation of the Flower Garden Bank Coral Reef as the first national marine sanctuary in the Gulf of Mexico. Although this designation is now no longer necessary, this bill provides a vehicle for a number of worthwhile measures.

Section 201 of title II will allow non-vessel-operating common carriers the option of proving financial responsibility using insurance or other surety. The current law only allows the posting of a bond which has proven to be costly to small businesses. This change to existing law will, in no way, diminish the level of financial responsibility required of NVOCC's.

Section 202 of title II would amend the Gambling Devices Act to allow gambling on U.S.-flag vessels if the principle use of the vessel is not the operation of a gambling establishment and if the gambling that is allowed begins when the vessel sails beyond a State's water. In essence, U.S.-flag vessels will be allowed the same privileges currently allowed or provided to foreign-flag operators. Nothing in this bill will harm existing foreign operators. Section 202 is virtually identical in legal effect to H.R. 3282, which passed the House under suspension on November 23, 1991, with the addition of provisions relating to the transportation of gambling devices.

Individual States are granted or delegated greater authority to enact legislation to prohibit gambling on cruises to nowhere and voyages between two points in the same State even if the vessel leaves State waters. However, nothing in H.R. 3866 or its limited delegations is to be construed as authorizing a State to enact statues which discriminate against U.S.-flag vessels.

The clear intent and purpose of this amendment to the Johnson Act is to allow those activities on U.S.-flag vessels to the same extent that they are currently allowed on foreign-flag vessels. For instance a State statute that authorized the use or possession of gambling devices on foreign-flag vessels but specifically prohibited that same activity on U.S.-flag vessels is beyond a State authority granted in title II of H.R. 3866. In contrast to the Hawaii statute concerning cruises to nowhere, which on its face is consistent with the provisions contained in H.R. 3866, the Florida statute (Law 1987, C87-225 §2; codified at title 44, §849.231(3)) would not be consistent with the provisions contained in H.R. 3866. The Florida statute unlike the Hawaii statute was enacted solely for the purpose of legalizing cruises to nowhere from its ports. Because of the provisions of the so-called Customs' seal (19 U.S.C. §1446; 29 CFR §§4.7-4.87), foreign-flag vessels are exempt by Federal law from State gambling device prohibiting on all voyages except for cruises to nowhere. The Florida statute, therefore, had no applicability except to these cruises. The statute excluded U.S.-flag vessels from the exemption because, at the time of enactment in 1987, the possession, transportation, and use of gambling devices was expressly prohibited on U.S.-flag vessels by the Federal Gambling Devices Act. Florida could not have passed a statute which contradicted Federal law or in other words allowed those activities on cruises-to-nowhere where the Federal law prohibited such activity. H.R. 3866 expressly removes the prohibition that sanctioned the Florida enactment. H.R. 3866, as passed by the Senate particularly with respect to changes to section 2 of the Johnson Act as they relate to transportation of gambling devices, goes even further than H.R. 3282 with respect to preventing discrimination against U.S.-flag vessels.

I want to thank Mr. John Keeney, Deputy Assistant Attorney General, Criminal Division, U.S. Department of Justice, and his chief assistant, Roger Adams, for their untiring efforts. Without their willingness to take a fresh look at these issues we would not be here today.

Finally, title III conforms domestic law with the U.S.-U.S.S.R. Maritime Boundary Agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation and urge the House to pass it.

□ 1350

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ORTIZ].

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3866, a bill incorporating several matters of importance to the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the maritime interests of our Nation.

I originally introduced H.R. 3866 on November 22, 1991, to provide for the expedited congressional approval of the Department of Commerce designation of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary.

This legislation was passed by the House on November 23, 1991, under suspension of the Rules.

H.R. 3866, as revised by the Senate, contains this designation and several other maritime and shipping matters which I strongly support.

By passing this bill today we can quickly bring these important and noncontroversial matters before the President for his signature without further delay.

At my request, the Flower Garden Banks were originally activated for sanctuary designation by congressional mandate as part of the 1988 amendments to the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972.

On Wednesday, November 20, 1991, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration submitted their notice designating the Flower Garden Banks as this country's 10th national marine sanctuary.

At the administration's request, H.R. 3866 will expedite the period of congressional review and allow for final designation to be published as soon as practicable.

I would like to thank Chairman JONES and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] for their leadership on this matter, and for working to ensure H.R. 3866's prompt consideration today.

In addition, I would like to express my thanks to the chairmen of the subcommittees of jurisdiction on this matter, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HERTEL] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] and also to the honorable gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN] for their support and leadership on this matter.

All interested parties have expressed their support for this expedited designation, and I know of no opposition to this bill. I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3866.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3866 and urge its adoption by the House.

This bill was introduced by our colleague, Congressman ORTIZ, in November 1991 and was passed by the House on November 23. It was returned to the House from the other body with an amendment on November 27. Unfortunately, the House was unable to complete action on the bill before recess.

I wish to call particular attention to title III of this bill which implements the maritime boundary agreement between the United States and the Soviet Union. This agreement was signed in June 1990 and has been ratified by the Senate. H.R. 3866 amends several U.S. laws to conform them with the terms of the maritime boundary agreement.

I also wish to note that the bill itself does not affect any claims of jurisdiction on lands and waters of the United States. In fact, it provides for effective United States fisheries jurisdiction over certain special areas that are technically within the Exclusive Economic Zone of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good bill which accomplishes a number of worthy purposes and I urges its adoption.

Mr. HERTEL. Mr. Speaker, I support the final approval of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary. The bill before us,

H.R. 3866, provides the final designation deadline for establishing the sanctuary boundaries. The Flower Garden Banks are located south of the Texas-Louisiana border at the edge of our Nation's Outer Continental Shelf, where some of our Nation's most interesting living coral reefs can be found. The East Flower Garden Bank is about 120 nautical miles southwest of Cameron, LA; and the West Bank is 110 nautical miles southeast of Galveston, TX.

With enactment of this legislation, the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary will now be formally established. This legislation allows the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to coordinate activities related to resource protection, research, and management in a fragile marine habitat for generations to enjoy.

I congratulate Mr. ORTIZ on this legislation, and I am pleased to support H.R. 3866 as returned to the House by the Senate.

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3866. This legislation will permit U.S.-flag cruise vessels to offer gambling to their passengers when embarked on cruises on the high seas. Currently, foreign-flag cruise ships departing from U.S. ports offer gambling but it is against the law for a U.S. ship to have gambling onboard. This prohibition has limited opportunities for American interests to engage in the profitable cruise ship trade.

H.R. 3866 changes the law so that both American and foreign-flag cruise ships will operate under the same rules regarding gambling onboard.

By allowing U.S.-flag vessels to have gambling devices onboard we will open doors for U.S. companies to acquire cruise vessels. The revenues received from gambling operations will allow American interests to design and construct new cruise ships in American shipyards to begin competing with the foreign-flag operations.

In addition to providing increased ship construction opportunities for American shipyards, new U.S.-flag cruise ships will mean additional sealift capacity for carrying military troops and it will create jobs for American seafarers who are sorely needed as a result of the decline in our merchant marine. All of these benefits will accrue without any cost to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee very carefully crafted this legislation as an amendment to the so-called Gambling Devices Act. It will allow the possession and operation of gambling equipment on U.S.-flag vessels to the same extent that gambling is allowed on foreign-flag vessels. This bill does not affect in any way the current prohibitions in the Gambling Ship Act, which make it illegal to operate a vessel that is principally engaged in gambling as a floating casino.

This bill preserves the right of a coastal State to enact legislation that prohibits gambling on a vessel that operates from a port of that State even if the vessel sails from that port out into international waters and then returns to the same port. The committee was aware that a number of coastal States do not want gambling on vessels in their waters and this legislation retains the right of States to continue to prohibit gambling.

Mr. Speaker, the prohibitions contained in the Gambling Devices Act have represented an economic barrier to the growth of the U.S.-flag cruise ship industry. This legislation will remove that economic barrier and provide an incentive for American businesses to build ships and begin operating in this extremely lucrative cruise ship trade.

The Department of Justice supports this bill.

I want to thank the chairman of our committee, WALTER JONES, and our ranking member, BOB DAVIS, for their help in moving this legislation forward. Also, I want to make special note of the efforts of our colleague from Mississippi, GENE TAYLOR, because he has been the driving force behind this bill.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 3866.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the Senate amendment just concurred in.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3866, FLOWER GARDEN BANKS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 268) to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill H.R. 3866.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 268

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in the enrollment of the bill (H.R. 3866) to provide for the designation of the Flower Garden Banks National Marine Sanctuary, the Clerk of the House of Representatives shall make the following corrections:

(1) Page 8, beginning at line 3, strike "United States-Soviet".

(2) Page 8, line 7, strike "the Soviet Union" and insert "Russia".

(3) Page 10, beginning at line 19, strike "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" and insert "Russia".

(4) Page 10, line 22, strike "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" and insert "Russia".

(5) Page 11, line 7, strike "the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" and insert "Russia."

(6) Page 14, line 9, strike "United States-Soviet".

(7) Page 14, line 12, stike "the Soviet Union" and insert "Russia".

(8) Page 14, line 18, strike "and" and insert "or".

(9) Page 15, beginning at line 2, strike "the special areas" and all that follows through line 4, and insert the following: "the areas referred to as eastern special areas in Article 3(1) of the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1, 1990; in particular, those areas east of the maritime boundary, as defined in that Agreement, that lie within 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of Russia is measured but beyond 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the United States is measured.'.".

(10) Page 15, beginning at line 26, strike "United States-Soviet Maritime" and insert "maritime".

(11) Page 16, line 4, strike "the Soviet Union" and insert "Russia".

(12) Page 16, strike line 9 and all that follows through line 14 and insert the following:

"SEC. 305. The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

'PLACES SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE UNITED STATES

'SEC. 19. For the purposes of this Act, the following areas are deemed to be places that are subject to the jurisdiction of the United States: The areas referred to as eastern special areas in Article 3(1) of the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1, 1990, in particular, those areas east of the maritime boundary, as defined in that Agreement, that lie within 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of Russia is measured but beyond 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the United States is measured.'.".

(13) Page 17, line 1, strike "United States-Soviet".

(14) Page 17, line 4, strike "the Soviet Union" and insert "Russia".

(15) Page 17, line 8, strike "3636(a)" and insert "3636(a))".

(16) Page 17, line 12, strike "303(6)" and insert "203(6)".

(17) Page 17, strike line 21 and all that follows through line 23 and insert the following:

"'(F) the areas referred to as eastern special areas in Article 3(1) of the Agreement between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Maritime Boundary, signed June 1, 1990; in particular, those areas east of the maritime boundary, as defined in that Agreement, that lie within 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of Russia is measured but beyond 200 nautical miles of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of the United States is measured; and'.".

(18) Page 18, line 4, strike "208" and insert "308".

(19) Page 18, line 5, strike "201(e)(3)" and insert "301(e)(3)".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

North Carolina [Mr. JONES] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DAVIS] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this concurrent resolution makes technical corrections to H.R. 3866, the bill that we just passed.

That bill contains a title implementing the United States-Soviet Union Maritime Boundary Agreement of June 1, 1990.

As we all know, there is no longer a Soviet Union. However, the boundary agreement is still valid—but now it is an agreement with Russia.

Therefore, in a number of places in the boundary title of the bill, the word "Russia" has to be inserted in place of the reference to the Soviet Union. These changes were suggested by the administration.

Also, this resolution corrects some reference problems in the Senate amendment.

I believe that the corrections made by the resolution have been cleared with our minority.

I urge the adoption of this concurrent resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. It is a technical measure made necessary due to the dramatic changes in the Soviet Union which occurred after Senate passage of the preceding bill. The resolution merely changes references in that bill to recognize the new Russian Republic.

I urge adoption of the bill.

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I, too, yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 268.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY PREEMINENCE ACT OF 1991

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 1989) to authorize appropriations for the National Institute of Standards and Technology and the Technology Administration of the Department of Commerce, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "American Technology Preeminence Act of 1991".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act—

(1) the term "high-resolution information systems" means equipment and techniques required to create, store, recover, and play back high-resolution images and accompanying sound;

(2) the term "advanced manufacturing technology" means numerically-controlled machine tools, robots, automated process control equipment, computerized flexible manufacturing systems, associated computer software, and other technology for improving manufacturing and industrial processes;

(3) the term "advanced materials" means a field of research including the study of composites, ceramics, metals, polymers, superconducting materials, materials produced through biotechnology, and materials production technologies, including coated systems, that provide the potential for significant advantages over existing materials;

(4) the term "Institute" means the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(5) the term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Commerce; and

(6) the term "Under Secretary" means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Technology Administration Authorization Act of 1991".

SEC. 102. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

Congress finds that in order to help United States industries to speed the development of new products and processes so as to maintain the economic competitiveness of the Nation, it is necessary to strengthen the programs and activities of the Department of Commerce's Technology Administration and National Institute of Standards and Technology.

SEC. 103. TECHNOLOGY ADMINISTRATION.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1992.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out the activities of the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Technology Policy, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, which shall be available for the following line items:

(A) Office of the Under Secretary, $2,000,000.

(B) Technology Policy, $4,000,000.

(C) Japanese Technical Literature, $1,500,000.

(D) Clearinghouse on State and Local Initiatives on Productivity, Technology, and Innovation, $1,000,000.

(E) National Technical Information Service, $1,500,000 to carry out the modernization plan described in section 212(f)(3)(D) of the National Technical Information Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 3704b(f)(3)(D)).

(2) Funds may be transferred among the line items listed in paragraph (1), so long as the net funds transferred to or from any line item do not exceed 10 percent of the amount authorized for that line item in such paragraph and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives are notified in advance of any such transfer.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 1993.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out the activities of the Under Secretary and the Assistant Secretary for Technology Policy, $10,000,000 for fiscal year 1993, which shall be available for the following line items:

(A) Office of the Under Secretary, $2,000,000.

(B) Technology Policy, $4,000,000.

(C) Japanese Technical Literature, $1,500,000.

(D) Clearinghouse on State and Local Initiatives on Productivity, Technology, and Innovation, $1,000,000.

(E) National Technical Information Service, $1,500,000 to carry out the modernization plan described in section 212(f)(3)(D) of the National Technical Information Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 3704b(f)(3)(D)).

(2) Funds may be transferred among the line items listed in paragraph (1), so long as the net funds transferred to or from any line item do not exceed 10 percent of the amount authorized for that line item in such paragraph and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives are notified in advance of any such transfer.

(c) OPERATING COSTS.—Operating costs for the National Technical Information Service associated with the acquisition, processing, storage, bibliographic control, and archiving of information and documents shall be recovered primarily through the collection of fees.

(d) REPORT AND CERTIFICATION TO CONGRESS.—Within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report which—

(1) describes the Department of Commerce's response to the Inspector General's Report No. ATD-024-0-001;

(2) includes a revised detailed modernization plan for the National Technical Information Service;

(3) contains a business plan for the National Technical Information Service which includes detailed profit and loss analysis for groups of products and services and for major market segments; and

(4) certifies that the National Technical Information Service has—

(A) employed a chief financial officer who is a certified public accountant or equivalently experienced accountant with experience in the dissemination of scientific and technical information; and

(B) begun taking reasonable steps toward strengthening its accounting system in response to the Inspector General's report described in paragraph (1).

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 5422(a) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4603a(a)) and section 273(c)(4) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1988 and 1989 (15 U.S.C. 4603(c)(4)) are each amended by striking "Economic Affairs" and inserting in lieu thereof "Technology".

SEC. 104. NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF STANDARDS AND TECHNOLOGY.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1992.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out the intramural scientific and technical research and services activities of the Institute, $210,000,000 for fiscal year 1992, which shall be available for the following line items:

(A) Electronics and Electrical Measurements, $33,700,000.

(B) Manufacturing Engineering, $13,500,000.

(C) Chemical Science and Technology, $22,000,000.

(D) Physics, $27,000,000.

(E) Materials Science and Engineering, $30,000,000.

(F) Building and Fire Research, $12,300,000.

(G) Computer Systems, $16,000,000.

(H) Applied Mathematics and Scientific Computing, $6,500,000.

(I) Technology Assistance, $11,000,000.

(J) Research Support Activities, $38,000,000.

(2)(A) Of the total of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), $2,000,000 are authorized only for steel technology.

(B) Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)(I)—

(i) $500,000 are authorized only for the evaluation of nonenergy-related inventions and related technology extension activities;

(ii) $250,000 are authorized only for Institute participation in the pilot program established under subsection (e); and

(iii) $2,700,000 are authorized only for the Institute's management of the extramural funding programs authorized under section 105.

(C) Of the total amount authorized under paragraph (1)(J), $7,565,000 are authorized only for the technical competence fund.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 1993.—(1) There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out the intramural scientific and technical research and services activities of the Institute, $221,200,000 for fiscal year 1993, which shall be available for the following line items:

(A) Electronics and Electrical Measurements, $36,000,000.

(B) Manufacturing Engineering, $16,000,000.

(C) Chemical Science and Technology, $22,500,000.

(D) Physics, $28,700,000.

(E) Materials Science and Engineering, $39,400,000.

(F) Building and Fire Research, $12,000,000.

(G) Computer Systems, $20,600,000.

(H) Applied Mathematics and Scientific Computing, $6,300,000.

(I) Technology Assistance, $10,800,000.

(J) Research Support Activities, $25,000,000.

(K) Pay Raise, $3,900,000.

(2)(A) Of the total of the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), $2,000,000 are authorized only for steel technology.

(B) Of the amount authorized under paragraph (1)(I)—

(i) $500,000 are authorized only for the evaluation of nonenergy-related inventions and related technology extension activities;

(ii) $250,000 are authorized only for Institute participation in the pilot program established under subsection (e); and

(iii) $5,000,000 are authorized only for the Institute's management of the extramural funding programs authorized under section 105.

(C) Of the total amount authorized under paragraph (1)(J), $7,223,000 are authorized only for the technical competence fund.

(3) In addition to the amounts authorized under paragraph (1), there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary for fiscal year 1993 $34,800,000 for the renovation and upgrading of the Institute's facilities.

(c) TRANSFERS.—(1) Funds may be transferred among the line items listed in subsection (a)(1) and among the line items listed in subsection (b)(1), so long as the net funds transferred to or from any line item do not exceed 10 percent of the amount authorized for that line item in such subsection and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives are notified in advance of any such transfer.

(2) The Secretary may propose transfers to or from any line item listed in subsection (a)(1) or subsection (b)(1) exceeding 10 percent of the amount authorized for such line item, but such proposed transfer may not be made unless—

(A) a full and complete explanation of any such proposed transfer and the reason therefor are transmitted in writing to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, and the appropriate authorizing Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and

(B) 30 calendar days have passed following the transmission of such written explanation.

(d) RELATION TO OTHER AUTHORIZATIONS.—Except for authorizations provided in the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (Public Law 100-418; 102 Stat. 1448), the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7701 et seq.), and the Steel and Aluminum Energy Conservation and Technology Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 5101 et seq.), this Act contains the complete authorizations of appropriations for the Institute for fiscal years 1992 and 1993. This subsection shall not limit the authority of the Institute to accept funds appropriated to any other Federal agency or to perform work for others.

(e) PILOT PROGRAM.—Pursuant to the authorizations contained in subsections (a)(1)(I) and (b)(1)(I), the Secretary is authorized to pay the Federal share of the cost of establishing and carrying out a standards assistance pilot program under section 112 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989 (15 U.S.C. 272 note). The purpose of the pilot program is to assist a country or countries that have requested assistance from the United States in the development of comprehensive industrial standards by providing the continuous presence of United States personnel on-site for a period of 2 or more years to provide such assistance and by providing, as necessary, additional technical support from within the Institute. Such funds shall be made available for such purpose only to the extent that matching funds are received by the National Institute of Standards and Technology from sources outside the Federal Government.

(f) CONSTRUCTION OF FACILITIES.—Section 14 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278d) is amended by striking "herein:" and all that follows, and inserting in lieu thereof "herein.".

(g) FIRE AND BUILDING PROGRAMS.—The fire research and building technology programs of the Institute may be combined for administrative purposes only, and separate budget accounts for fire research and building technology shall be maintained. No later than December 31, 1992, the Secretary, acting through the Director of the Institute, shall report to Congress on the results of the combination, on efforts to preserve the integrity of the fire research and building technology programs, on the long-range basic and applied research plans of the two programs, on procedures for receiving advice on fire and earthquake research priorities from constituencies concerned with public safety, and on the relation between the combined program at the Institute and the United States Fire Administration.

(h) EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS.—(1) Section 18 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g-1) is amended by striking the period at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof ", and to United States citizens for research and technical activities on Institute programs.".

(2) Section 17 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278g) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d) For any scientific and engineering disciplines for which there is a shortage of suitably qualified and available United States citizens and nationals, the Secretary is authorized to recruit and employ in scientific and engineering fields at the Institute foreign nationals who have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence under the Immigration and Nationality Act and who intend to become United States citizens. Employment of a person under this paragraph shall not be subject to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing employment in the competitive service, or to any prohibition in any other Act against the employment of aliens, or against the payment of compensation to them.".

(i) CORE PROGRAM FUNDING.—It is the sense of the Congress that the intramural scientific and technical research and services activities of the National Institute of Standards and Technology should share fully in any funding increases provided to the Institute.

SEC. 105. EXTRAMURAL PROGRAMS OF THE INSTITUTE.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1992.—In addition to any sums otherwise authorized under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out the extramural industrial technology services programs of the Institute created under sections 25, 26, and 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k, 278l, and 278n), $127,500,000 for fiscal year 1992, which shall be available for the following line items:

(1) Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology, $25,000,000.

(2) State Technology Extension Program, $2,500,000.

(3) Advanced Technology Program, $100,000,000.

(b) FISCAL YEAR 1993.—In addition to any sums otherwise authorized under this Act, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary, to carry out the extramural industrial technology services programs of the Institute created under sections 25, 26, and 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k, 278l, and 278n), $127,500,000 for fiscal year 1993, which shall be available for the following line items:

(1) Regional Centers for the Transfer of Manufacturing Technology and Satellite Manufacturing Centers, $25,000,000.

(2) State Technology Extension Program, $2,500,000.

(3) Advanced Technology Program, $100,000,000.

(c) LIMITATION.—No funds are authorized under this section for any project under the extramural programs of the Institute which have not been competitively reviewed through the merit review processes required by the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 271 et seq.).

(d) AMENDMENTS TO EXTENSION PROGRAM.—Section 5121(b) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 278l note) is amended by striking paragraph (5).

(e) AMENDMENTS TO EXTENSION ACTIVITIES.—(1) Section 25(c)(6) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k(c)(6)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: "except for contracts for such specific technology extension or transfer services as may be specified by statute or by the Director".

(2) Section 25(d) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278k(d)) is amended to read as follows:

"(d) In addition to such sums as may be authorized and appropriated to the Secretary and Director to operate the Centers program, the Secretary and Director also may accept funds from other Federal departments and agencies for the purpose of providing Federal funds to support Centers. Any Center which is supported with funds which originally came from other Federal departments and agencies shall be selected and operated according to the provisions of this section.".

(f) ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 5142(f) of the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4632(f)) is amended by striking "and 1990" and inserting in lieu thereof "1990, 1991, 1992, and 1993".

SEC. 106. SALARY ADJUSTMENTS.

In addition to any sums otherwise authorized by this Act, there are authorized to be appro-

priated to the Secretary for fiscal years 1992 and 1993 such additional sums as may be necessary to make any adjustments in salary, pay, retirement and other employee benefits which may be provided for by law.

SEC. 107. METRIC AMENDMENT.

(a) The Fair Packaging and Labeling Act (15 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) is amended—

(1) in sections 4(a) (2), (4), and (5), 4(b), and 5(c)(1), by striking "weight" and inserting in lieu thereof "weight or mass";

(2) in sections 4(a)(5) and 5(d), by striking "weights" and inserting in lieu thereof "weights or masses";

(3) in section 4(a)(2), by inserting ", using the most appropriate units of the SI metric system as the primary system for measuring quantity" after "panel of that label"; and

(4) in section 4(a)(3)(A)—

(A) by striking "containing" and inserting in lieu thereof "that also displays the avoirdupois system of measure, and that contains" in clause (i);

(B) by inserting "that also displays the avoirdupois system of measure" after "random package" in clause (ii);

(C) by inserting "that also displays the avoirdupois system of measure" after "linear measure" in clause (iii); and

(D) by inserting "that also displays the avoirdupois system of measure" after "measure of area" in clause (iv).

(b) This section shall take effect 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 108. TRANSFER OF FEDERAL SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL INFORMATION.

(a) TRANSFER.—The head of each Federal executive department or agency shall transfer in a timely manner to the National Technical Information Service unclassified scientific, technical, and engineering information which results from federally funded research and development activities for dissemination to the private sector, academia, State and local governments, and Federal agencies. Only information which would otherwise be available for public dissemination shall be transferred under this subsection. Such information shall include technical reports and information, computer software, application assessments generated pursuant to section 11(c) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710(c)), and information regarding training technology and other federally owned or originated technologies. The Secretary shall issue regulations within one year after the date of enactment of this Act outlining procedures for the ongoing transfer of such information to the National Technical Information Service.

(b) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—As part of the annual report required under section 212(f)(3) of the National Technical Information Act of 1988, the Secretary shall report to Congress on the status of efforts under this section to ensure access to Federal scientific and technical information by the public. Such report shall include—

(1) an evaluation of the comprehensiveness of transfers of information by each Federal executive department or agency under subsection (a);

(2) a description of the use of Federal scientific and technical information;

(3) plans for improving public access to Federal scientific and technical information; and

(4) recommendations for legislation necessary to improve public access to Federal scientific and technical information.

SEC. 109. AVAILABILITY OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Appropriations made under the authority provided in this Act shall remain available for obligation, for expenditure, or for obligation and expenditure for periods specified in the Acts making such appropriations.

SEC. 110. REPORT ON FACILITIES NEEDS.

By March 1, 1992, the Director of the Institute shall submit to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate and the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives a report on what renovations and upgrades of Institute facilities are necessary over the next decade. The report shall include a ranking of facilities needs in order of priority, an estimate of costs, and the Director's plan for meeting these needs.

SEC. 111. BUY-AMERICAN PROVISIONS.

(a) RESTRICTIONS ON CONTRACT AWARDS.—No contract or subcontract made with funds authorized under this title may be awarded for the procurement of an article, material, or supply produced or manufactured in a foreign country whose government unfairly maintains in government procurement a significant and persistent pattern or practice of discrimination against United States products or services which results in identifiable harms to United States businesses, as identified by the President pursuant to subsection (g)(1)(A) of section 305 of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979 (19 U.S.C. 2515(g)(1)(A)). Any such determination shall be made in accordance with such section 305.

(b) PROHIBITION AGAINST FRAUDULENT USE OF "MADE IN AMERICA" LABELS.—If it has been finally determined by a court or a Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a "Made in America" inscription, or an inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, that person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract from the Department of Commerce, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures in subpart 9.4 of chapter 1 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.

(c) BUY-AMERICAN REQUIREMENT.—(1) The Secretary is authorized to award to a domestic firm a contract for the purchase of goods that, under the use of competitive procedures, would be awarded to a foreign firm, if—

(A) the final product of the domestic firm will be completely assembled in the United States;

(B) when completely assembled, more than 50 percent of the final product of the domestic firm will be domestically produced; and

(C) the difference between the bids submitted by the foreign and domestic firms is not more than 6 percent.

(2) This subsection shall not apply to the extent to which—

(A) in the opinion of the Secretary, after taking into consideration international obligations and trade relations, such applicability would not be in the public interest;

(B) in the opinion of the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense, compelling national security considerations require otherwise; or

(C) the President determines that such an award would be in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade or an international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(3) This subsection shall apply only to contracts made for which—

(A) amounts are authorized by this title to be made available; and

(B) solicitations for bids are issued after the date of enactment of this Act.

(4) The Secretary, before January 1, 1993, shall report to the Congress on contracts covered under this subsection—

(A) entered into with foreign firms pursuant to a determination made under paragraph (2) of this subsection; and

(B) awarded to domestic firms pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection, in fiscal years 1991 and 1992.

(5) For purposes of this subsection—

(A) the term "domestic firm" means a business entity that is incorporated in the United States and that conducts business operations in the United States; and

(B) the term "foreign firm" means a business entity not described in subparagraph (A).

TITLE II—ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

SEC. 201. EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This title may be cited as the "Emerging Technologies and Advanced Technology Program Amendments Act of 1991".

(b) FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.—(1) The Congress finds that—

(A) technological innovation and its profitable inclusion in commercial products are critical components of the ability of the United States to raise the living standards of Americans and to compete in world markets;

(B) maintaining viable United States-based high technology industries is vital to both the national security and the economic well-being of the United States;

(C) the Department of Commerce has reported that the United States is losing or losing badly, relative to Japan and Europe, in many important emerging technologies and risks losing much of the $350,000,000,000 United States market and $1,000,000,000,000 world market expected to develop by the year 2000 for products based on emerging technologies;

(D) it is in the national interest for the Federal Government to encourage and, in selected cases, provide limited financial assistance to industry-led private sector efforts to increase research and development in economically critical areas of technology;

(E) joint ventures are a particularly effective and appropriate way to pool resources to conduct research that no single company is likely to undertake but which will create new generic technologies that will benefit an entire industry and the welfare of the Nation;

(F) it is vital that industry within the United States attain a leadership role and capability in development, design, and manufacturing in fields such as high-resolution information systems, advanced manufacturing, and advanced materials; and

(G) the Advanced Technology Program, established under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n), is the appropriate vehicle for the United States Government to provide limited assistance to joint development within the United States of new high technology capabilities in fields such as high-resolution information systems, advanced manufacturing technology, and advanced materials, and can help encourage United States industry to work together on problems of mutual concern.

(2) The purposes of this section are—

(A) to strengthen the Advanced Technology Program created under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n), and to provide improved guidelines for the allocation of Advanced Technology Program funds appropriated under the authorizations contained in section 105 of this Act;

(B) to promote and assist in the development of advanced technologies and the generic application of such technologies to civilian products, processes, and services;

(C) to improve the competitive position of United States industry by supporting industry-led research and development projects in areas of emerging technology which have substantial potential to advance the economic well-being and national security of the United States, such as high-resolution information systems, advanced manufacturing technology, and advanced materials; and

(D) to support projects that range from idea exploration to prototype development and address long-term, high-risk areas of technological research, development, and application that are

not otherwise being adequately developed by the private sector, but are likely to yield important benefits to the Nation.

(c) ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM.—(1) Section 28(a) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(a)), is amended by adding at the end the following new sentence: "In operating the Program, the Secretary and Director shall, as appropriate, be guided by the findings and recommendations of the Biennial National Critical Technology Reports prepared pursuant to section 603 of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6683).".

(2) Section 28(b)(1) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(b)(1)), is amended by inserting "industry-led" immediately after "aid".

(3) Section 28(b)(1)(B) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(b)(1)(B)), is amended by inserting "by means of grants, cooperative agreements, or contracts" immediately after "such joint ventures".

(4) Section 28(b)(2) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(b)(2)), is amended to read as follows:

"(2) provide grants to and enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with United States businesses (especially small businesses), provided that emphasis is placed on applying the Institute's research, research techniques, and expertise to those organizations' research programs;".

(5) Section 28(d)(2) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(d)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) In the case of joint ventures, the Program shall not make an award unless the award will facilitate the formation of a joint venture or the initiation of a new research and development project by an existing joint venture.".

(6) Section 28(d) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(d)(7)) is amended—

(A) by striking paragraph (7);

(B) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively; and

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

"(9) A company shall be eligible to receive financial assistance under this section only if—

"(A) the Secretary finds that the company's participation in the Program would be in the economic interest of the United States, as evidenced by investments in the United States in research, development, and manufacturing (including, for example, the manufacture of major components or subassemblies in the United States); significant contributions to employment in the United States; and agreement with respect to any technology arising from assistance provided under this section to promote the manufacture within the United States of products resulting from that technology (taking into account the goals of promoting the competitiveness of United States industry), and to procure parts and materials from competitive suppliers; and

"(B) either—

"(i) the company is a United States-owned company; or

"(ii) the Secretary finds that the company is incorporated in the United States and has a parent company which is incorporated in a country which affords to United States-owned companies opportunities, comparable to those afforded to any other company, to participate in any joint venture similar to those authorized under this Act; affords to United States-owned companies local investment opportunities comparable to those afforded to any other company; and affords adequate and effective protection for the intellectual property rights of United States-owned companies.

"(10) Grants, contracts, and cooperative assignments under this section shall be designed to support projects which are high risk and which have the potential for eventual substantial widespread commercial application. In order to receive a grant, contract, or cooperative agreement under this section, a research and development entity shall demonstrate to the Secretary the requisite ability in research and technology development and management in the project area in which the grant, contract, or cooperative agreement is being sought.

"(11)(A) Title to any intellectual property arising from assistance provided under this section shall vest in a company or companies incorporated in the United States. The United States may reserve a nonexclusive, nontransferable, irrevocable paid-up license, to have practiced for or on behalf of the United States, in connection with any such intellectual property, but shall not, in the exercise of such license, publicly disclose proprietary information related to the license. Title to any such intellectual property shall not be transferred or passed, except to a company incorporated in the United States, until the expiration of the first patent obtained in connection with such intellectual property.

"(B) For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'intellectual property' means an invention patentable under title 35, United States Code, or any patent on such an invention.

"(C) Nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prohibit the licensing to any company of intellectual property rights arising from assistance provided under this section.".

(7) Section 28(e) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n(e)) is amended to read as follows:

"(e) The Secretary may, within 30 days after notice to Congress, suspend a company or joint venture from continued assistance under this section if the Secretary determines that the company, the country of incorporation of the company or a parent company, or the joint venture has failed to satisfy any of the criteria set forth in subsection (d)(9), and that it is in the national interest of the United States to do so.".

(8) Section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

"(f) When reviewing private sector requests for awards under the Program, and when monitoring the progress of assisted research projects, the Secretary and the Director shall, as appropriate, coordinate with the Secretary of Defense and other senior Federal officials to ensure cooperation and coordination in Federal technology programs and to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort. The Secretary and the Director are authorized to work with the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Secretary of Defense, and other appropriate Federal officials to form interagency working groups or special project offices to coordinate Federal technology activities.

"(g) In order to analyze the need for the value of joint ventures and other research projects in specific technical fields, to evaluate any proposal made by a joint venture or company requesting the Secretary's assistance, or to monitor the progress of any joint venture or any company research project which receives Federal funds under the Program, the Secretary, the Under Secretary of Commerce for Technology, and the Director may, notwithstanding any other provision of law, meet with such industry sources as they consider useful and appropriate.

"(h) Up to 10 percent of the funds appropriated for carrying out this section may be used for standards development and technical activities by the Institute in support of the purposes of this section.

"(i) In addition to such sums as may be authorized and appropriated to the Secretary and Director to operate the Program, the Secretary and Director also may accept funds from other Federal departments and agencies for the purpose of providing Federal funds to support awards under the Program. Any Program award which is supported with funds which originally came from other Federal departments and agencies shall be selected and carried out according to the provisions of this section.

"(j) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'joint venture' means any group of activities, including attempting to make, making, or performing a contract, by two or more persons for the purpose of—

"(A) theoretical analysis, experimentation, or systematic study of phenomena or observable facts;

"(B) the development or testing of basic engineering techniques;

"(C) the extension of investigative finding or theory of a scientific or technical nature into practical application for experimental and demonstration purposes, including the experimental production and testing of models, prototypes, equipment, materials, and processes;

"(D) the collection, exchange, and analysis of research information;

"(E) the production of any product, process, or service; or

"(F) any combination of the purposes specified in subparagraphs (A), (B), (C), (D), and (E),

and may include the establishment and operation of facilities for the conducting of research, the conducting of such venture on a protected and proprietary basis, and the prosecuting of applications for patents and the granting of licenses for the results of such venture; and

"(2) the term 'United States-owned company' means a company that has majority ownership or control by individuals who are citizens of the United States.".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments in subsection (c) shall take effect immediately upon enactment; however, the amendments shall not apply to applications submitted before the date of enactment of this Act.

(e) MANAGEMENT COSTS.—Section 2 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 272) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) In carrying out the extramural funding programs of the Institute, including the programs established under sections 25, 26, and 28 of this Act, the Secretary may retain reasonable amounts of any funds appropriated pursuant to authorizations for these programs in order to pay for the Institute's management of these programs.".

(f) COMPREHENSIVE REPORT.—The Secretary shall, not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to each House of the Congress and the President a comprehensive report on the results of the Advanced Technology Program established under section 28 of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278n), including any activities in the areas of high-resolution information systems, advanced manufacturing technology, and advanced materials.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE STEVENSON-WYDLER TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION ACT OF 1980

SEC. 301. FEDERAL LABORATORY CONSORTIUM.

(a) Section 11(e)(2) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710(e)(2)) is amended by inserting "senior" after "Consortium and a".

(b) Section 11(e)(6) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710(e)(6)) is amended by adding at the end the

following: "Such report shall include an annual independent audit of the financial statements of the Consortium, conducted in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles.".

(c) Section 11(e)(7)(B)(ii) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710(e)(7)(B)(ii)) is amended by striking "or 1991" and inserting in lieu thereof "1991, 1992, 1993, 1994, 1995, or 1996".

(d) Section 11(e)(8) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710(e)(8)) is repealed.

SEC. 302. COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS.

(a) Section 12(d)(1) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710a(d)(1)) is amended by inserting "intellectual property," after "equipment," both places it appears.

(b) Within 6 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report to the Congress on the advisability of authorizing a new form of cooperative research and development agreement which would permit Federal contributions of funds.

SEC. 303. RESEARCH EQUIPMENT.

Section 11 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(i) RESEARCH EQUIPMENT.—The Director of a laboratory, or the head of any Federal agency or department, may give research equipment that is excess to the needs of the laboratory, agency, or department to an educational institution or nonprofit organization for the conduct of technical and scientific education and research activities. Title of ownership shall transfer with a gift under the section.".

SEC. 304. DEFINITION OF FEDERAL AGENCY.

Section 4(8) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3703(8)) is amended by inserting ", as well as any agency of the legislative branch of the Federal Government" after "of such title".

SEC. 305. QUALITY IMPROVEMENT.

Section 17(f) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3711a(f)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "The Director is authorized to use appropriated funds to carry out responsibilities under this Act.".

SEC. 306. UNDER SECRETARY.

Section 5(c) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3704(c)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating paragraphs (13) and (14) as paragraphs (14) and (15), respectively; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (12) the following new paragraph:

"(13) serve as a focal point for discussions among United States companies on topics of interest to industry and labor, including discussions regarding manufacturing and discussions regarding emerging technologies;".

TITLE IV—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REDUCING CAPITAL COSTS FOR EMERGING TECHNOLOGY

SEC. 401. NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REDUCING CAPITAL COSTS FOR EMERGING TECHNOLOGY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—There is established a National Commission on Reducing Capital Costs for Emerging Technology (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Commission"), for the purpose of developing recommendations to increase the competitiveness of United States industry by encouraging investments in research, the development of new process and product technologies, and the production of those technologies.

(b) ISSUES.—The function of the Commission shall be to address the following issues:

(1) How has the overall cost of capital paid by United States companies differed during the past decade from that paid by companies in other industrial economies such as Germany, Japan, and the United Kingdom?

(2) To what extent has the cost of capital faced by technology companies differed from the overall cost of capital in each of these nations during the same period?

(3) To what extent do high capital costs in general inhibit investment in projects with long-term payoffs, such as the development and commercialization of new technology?

(4) To what extent does the structure of the financial services industry in the United States affect the flow of capital to advanced technology investment, and to what extent do current practices in the equity markets raise the cost of capital and inhibit the availability of capital to fund research and development, purchase advanced manufacturing equipment, and fund other investments necessary to commercialize advanced technology?

(5) In what ways do Government regulations influence the cost of capital in the United States?

(6) To what extent have national differences in capital costs facilitated the foreign acquisition of technology-based United States companies?

(7) What macroeconomic and other policies would promote greater investment in advanced manufacturing techniques, in research and development, and in other activities necessary to commercialize and produce new technologies?

(8) What specific policies should the Federal Government follow in order to reduce the cost of capital for United States companies to levels that are near parity with those faced by the Nation's principal trading partners?

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—(1) The Commission shall be composed of 9 members who are eminent in such fields as advanced technology, manufacturing, finance, and international economics and who are appointed as follows:

(A) 3 individuals appointed by the President, one of whom shall chair the Commission.

(B) 3 individuals appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, 1 of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader of the House of Representatives.

(C) 3 individuals appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate, 2 of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the majority leader of the Senate and 1 of whom shall be appointed upon the recommendation of the minority leader of the Senate.

(2) Each member shall be appointed for the life of the Commission. A vacancy in the Commission shall be filled in the manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) PROCEDURES.—(1) The chairman shall call the first meeting of the Commission within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) Recommendations of the Commission shall require the approval of three-quarters of the members of the Commission.

(3) The Commission may use such personnel detailed from Federal agencies as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its duties.

(4) Members of the Commission, other than full-time employees of the Federal Government, while attending meetings of the Commission while away from their homes or regular places of business, shall be allowed travel expenses in accordance with subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(e) REPORTS.—The Commission shall, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the President and Congress a report containing legislative and other recommendations with respect to the issues addressed under subsection (b).

(f) CONSULTATION.—The Commission shall consult, as appropriate, with the Commission on Technology and Procurement established by section 505 of this Act.

(g) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate 6 months after the submission of its report under subsection (e).

(h) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal years 1992 and 1993.

TITLE V—STUDIES AND REPORTS

SEC. 501. HIGH-RESOLUTION INFORMATION SYSTEMS ADVISORY BOARD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSE.—The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall establish within that office a High-Resolution Information Systems Advisory Board (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Board") to monitor and, as appropriate, foster the development of United States-based high-resolution information systems industries.

(b) DEFINITION.—As used in this title, the term "high-resolution information systems" means the equipment and techniques required to create, store, recover, and play back high-resolution images and accompanying sound.

(c) FUNCTIONS.—The board shall—

(1) collect and analyze information on the range of factors which will determine whether United States-based high-resolution information systems industries will develop and become competitive, including such factors as technology policies, specialized financial problems, international standards and foreign trade practices, Federal regulations and procurement policies, and licensing practices;

(2) identify areas where appropriate cooperation between the Federal Government and the private sector, including Government support for industry-led joint research and development ventures, would enhance United States industrial competitiveness in this area, and provide advice and guidance for such cooperative efforts;

(3) provide guidance on what Federal policies and practices, particularly in such areas as procurement and the transfer of federally-funded research, are necessary to help establish United States-based high-resolution information systems industries;

(4) provide advice on the coordination of Federal defense and civilian activities to maximize and assist with the transfer of technologies in the field of high-resolution information systems into commercial products; and

(5) generally develop recommendations for guiding Federal agency activities related to the development of United States-based high-resolution information systems industries.

(d) MEMBERSHIP AND PROCEDURES.—(1)(A) The Board shall be composed of 13 members, 7 of whom shall constitute a quorum.

(B) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Secretary, the Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, and the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, or their designees, shall serve as members of the Board.

(C) The President, acting through the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, shall appoint as additional members of the Board—

(i) 5 members from the private electronics manufacturing sector, drawn from such sectors as semiconductors, display equipment, computers, consumer electronics, and telecommunications, with 1 member also representing labor;

(ii) 3 members from the private nonmanufacturing sector, including 1 representative from the transmission delivery the software industry, the entertainment industry, and the investment community; and

(iii) 1 member from academia.

At least 1 member appointed under this subparagraph shall be from small business.

(2) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy or the Director's designee shall chair the Board.

(3) The chairman shall call the first meeting of the Board within 30 days after the appointment of members is completed.

(4) The Board may use such personnel detailed from Federal agencies as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

(5) Members of the Board, other than full-time employees of the Federal Government, while attending meetings of the Board or otherwise performing duties of the Board while away from their homes or regular places of business, shall be allowed travel expenses in accordance with subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(6) The Board shall submit a report of its activities once every year after its establishment to the President, the Committees on Science, Space, and Technology and on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives, and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

(e) LIMITATION ON FUNCTIONS.—Nothing in this section or any other provision of this Act shall be construed—

(1) to authorize the Board to investigate or provide advice or guidance with respect to standards or other regulations or policies related to the transmission, delivery, or receipt of broadcast television or cable television signals subject to regulation by the Federal Communications Commission under the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 151 et seq.); or

(2) to limit, modify, or affect in any manner the authorities, functions or responsibilities of the Federal Communications Commission or the National Telecommunications and Information Administration.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal years 1992 and 1993.

SEC. 502. MAJOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROPOSALS.

The National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 is amended by adding at the end of title II the following new section:

"MAJOR SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY PROPOSALS

"SEC. 209. The Director shall identify and provide an annual report to Congress on each major multinational science and technology project, in which the United States is not a participant, which has a total estimated cost greater than $1,000,000,000.".

SEC. 503. BIENNIAL NATIONAL CRITICAL TECHNOLOGIES REPORT AMENDMENTS.

Section 603 of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6683) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ", but shall include the most economically important emerging civilian technologies during the 10-year period following such report, together with the estimated current and future size of domestic and international markets for products derived from these technologies" after "may not exceed 30";

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "national security and" and inserting in lieu thereof "national security or";

(3) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(4) by inserting after subsection (c) the following new subsection:

"(d) Each such report shall include—

"(1) an identification of the types of research and development needed to close any significant gaps or deficiencies in the technology base of the United States, as compared with the technology bases of major trading partners; and

"(2) a list of the technologies and markets targeted by major trading partners for development or capture.".

SEC. 504. CRITICAL INDUSTRIES.

(a) IDENTIFICATION OF INDUSTRIES AND DEVELOPMENT OF PLAN.—The Secretary shall—

(1) identify those civilian industries in the United States that are necessary to support a robust manufacturing infrastructure and critical to the economic security of the United States; and

(2) list the major research and development initiatives being undertaken, and the substantial investments being made, by the Federal Government, including its research laboratories, in each of the critical industries identified under paragraph (1).

(b) INITIAL REPORT.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Congress within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act on the actions taken under subsection (a).

(c) ANNUAL UPDATES.—The Secretary shall annually submit to the Congress an update of the report submitted under subsection (b). Each such update shall—

(1) describe the status of each identified critical industry, including the advances and declines occurring since the most recent report; and

(2) identify any industries that should be added to the list of critical industries.

SEC. 505. RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TECHNOLOGY UTILIZATION, AND GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT POLICY.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMISSION.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, shall establish a Commission on Technology and Procurement (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Commission"), for the purposes of analyzing the effect of Federal Government procurement laws, procedures, and policies on the development of advanced technologies within the United States and making recommendations on how Federal policy could be changed to promote further the development of advanced technologies.

(b) ISSUES.—The Commission shall address the following issues:

(1) To what extent, if any, should Federal Government technology purchase strategies be used to give domestic suppliers a competitive advantage in new generations of existing technologies and in initial market penetration for new technologies?

(2) Under what conditions can Federal Government purchases of advanced technology-based products be based on performance specifications rather than on product specifications? Should Federal Government procurement first look to the commercial markets for products that will meet performance specifications before purchasing a unique product that has to be developed?

(3) How can the Federal Government procurement laws, practices, and procedures be used as a strategic tool to foster the use of emerging technologies?

(4) How can the Federal Government ensure that its suppliers adopt the principles embodied in the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award?

(5) Should Federal Government procurement practices include cooperative efforts between the supplier and the Federal entity to develop products so as to be more easily marketed on a commercial basis? Should a program for the exchange of technical personnel to foster innovation in product development be part of such practices?

(6) To what extent, if any, should Federal Government documents specify standards that are beneficial to domestic suppliers, aid the compatibility of advanced technologies, and speed the commercial acceptance of those technologies, and what would be the role of the Institute in such an effort?

(7) Should Federal Government procurement be linked to the Advanced Technology Program and to technology transfer activities so that specification development can incorporate the latest technical advances available?

(8) To what extent should worldwide, state of the art technology be required in Federal Government procurement?

(c) MEMBERSHIP AND PROCEDURES.—(1) The Commission shall be composed of 15 members, 8 of whom shall constitute a quorum.

(2) The Secretary, the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, or their designees who serve in executive level positions, shall serve as members of the Commission.

(3) The Secretary shall appoint as members of the Commission, from among individuals not employed by the Federal Government—

(A) 4 members who are eminent in advanced technology businesses representing manufacturing and services industries, including at least 1 member representing labor;

(B) 3 members who are eminent in the fields of technology and international economic development; and

(C) with the concurrence of the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, 3 members who are eminent in the field of Federal Government procurement.

(4) The Secretary shall appoint a Commission chairman from among the members of the Commission. The chairman shall call the first meeting of the Commission within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(5) The Secretary and the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy shall provide such staff as may be required by the Commission to carry out its responsibilities.

(6) Members of the Commission, other than full-time employees of the Federal Government, while attending meetings of the Commission or otherwise performing duties of the Commission while away from their homes or regular places of business, shall be allowed travel expenses in accordance with subchapter I of chapter 57 of title 5, United States Code.

(d) REPORTS.—(1) The Commission shall, within 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Secretary, the Administrator of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, the President, and Congress a report containing preliminary recommendations with respect to the issues addressed under subsection (b).

(2) The Commission shall, within 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Secretary and Congress a final report containing final recommendations with respect to the issues addressed under subsection (b).

(e) CONSULTATION.—The Commission shall consult, as appropriate, with the National Commission on Reducing Capital Costs for Emerging Technology.

(f) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate 6 months after the submission of its final report under subsection (d)(2).

(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal years 1992, 1993, and 1994.

SEC. 506. REPORT ON INFORMATION COLLECTION AND DISSEMINATION.

(a) REPORT.—Within 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall report to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate on the feasibility of establishing and operating a Federal Online Information Product Catalog (FEDLINE) at the National Technical Information Service which would serve as a comprehensive inventory and

authorizative register of information products and services disseminated by the Federal Government and assist agencies and the public in locating Federal Government information. Information protected from public disclosure shall not be included. In studying the concept, the Secretary, acting through the Under Secretary and the Director of the National Technical Information Service, shall consult with officials from appropriate Government agencies, including the Office of Management and Budget, the National Archives, the Government Printing Office, and the Institute, and with representatives of the public, for their views on the optimal composition and format of FEDLINE. Such report shall contain cost estimates and possible funding sources for establishing and operating FEDLINE and shall list any changes in law and regulation that would be required if FEDLINE were to be implemented.

(b) FUNDING.—The Director of the National Technical Information Service may retain and use all monies received, including receipts, revenues, and advanced payments and deposits, to fund obligations and expenses through the end of fiscal year 1993.

(c) ELECTRONIC FORMAT.—Section 212(e)(5) of the National Technical Information Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 3704b(e)(5)) is amended by inserting ", including producing and disseminating information products in electronic format" after "engineering information".

SEC. 507. NATIONAL QUALITY COUNCIL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND FUNCTIONS.—There is established a National Quality Council (hereafter in this section referred to as the "Council"). The functions of the Council shall be—

(1) to establish national goals and priorities for Quality performance in business, education, government, and all other sectors of the nation;

(2) to encourage and support the voluntary adoption of these goals and priorities by companies, unions, professional and business associations, coalition groups, and units of government, as well as private and nonprofit organizations;

(3) to arouse and maintain the interest of the people of the United States in Quality performance, and to encourage the adoption and institution of Quality performance methods by all corporations, government agencies, and other organizations; and

(4) to conduct a White House Conference on Quality Performance in the American Workplace that would bring together in a single forum national leaders in business, labor, education, professional societies, the media, government, and politics to address Quality performance as a means of improving United States competitiveness.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Council shall consist of not less than 17 or more than 20 members, appointed by the Secretary. Members shall include—

(1) at least 2 but not more than 3 representatives from manufacturing industry;

(2) at least 2 but not more than 3 representatives from service industry;

(3) at least 2 but not more than 3 representatives from national Quality not-for-profit organizations;

(4) two representatives from education, one with expertise in elementary and secondary education, and one with expertise in post-secondary education;

(5) one representative from labor;

(6) one representative from professional societies;

(7) one representative each from local and State government;

(8) one representative from the Federal Quality Institute;

(9) one representative from the National Institute of Standards and Technology;

(10) one representative from the Department of Defense;

(11) one representative from a civilian Federal agency not otherwise represented on the Council, to be rotated among such agencies every 2 years; and

(12) one representative from the Foundation for the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award.

(c) TERMS.—The term of office of each member of the Council appointed under paragraphs (1) through (7) of subsection (b) shall be 2 years, except that when making the initial appointments under such paragraphs; the Secretary shall appoint not more than 50 percent of the members to 1 year terms. No member appointed under such paragraphs shall serve on the Council for more than 2 consecutive terms.

(d) CHAIRMAN AND VICE CHAIRMAN.—The Secretary shall designate one of the members initially appointed to the Council as Chairman. Thereafter, the members of the Council shall annually elect one of their number as Chairman. The members of the Council shall also annually elect one of their members as Vice Chairman. No individual shall serve as Chairman or Vice Chairman for more than 2 consecutive years.

(e) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND EMPLOYEES.—The Council shall appoint and fix the compensation of an Executive Director, who shall hire and fix the compensation of such additional employees as may be necessary to assist the Council in carrying out its functions. In hiring such additional employees, the Executive Director shall ensure that no individual hired has a conflict of interest with the responsibilities of the Council.

(f) FUNDING.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a National Quality Performance Trust Fund, into which all funds received by the Council, through private donations or otherwise, shall be deposited. Amounts in such Trust Fund shall be available to the Council, to the extent provided in advance in appropriations Acts, for the purpose of carrying out the functions of the Council under this Act.

(g) CONTRIBUTIONS.—The Council may not accept private donations from a single source in excess of $25,000 per year. Private donations from a single source in excess of $10,000 per year may be accepted by the Council only on approval of two-thirds of the Council.

(h) ANNUAL REPORT.—The Council shall annually submit to the President and the Congress a comprehensive and detailed report on—

(1) the progress in meeting the goals and priorities established by the Council;

(2) the Council's operations, activities, and financial condition;

(3) contributions to the Council from non-Federal sources;

(4) plans for the Council's operations and activities for the future; and

(5) any other information or recommendations the Council considers appropriate.

SEC. 508. STUDY OF TESTING AND CERTIFICATION.

(a) CONTRACT WITH NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL.—Within 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act and within available appropriations, the Secretary shall enter into a contract with the National Research Council for a thorough review of international product testing and certification issues. The National Research Council will be asked to address the following issues and make recommendations as appropriate:

(1) The impact on United States manufacturers, testing and certification laboratories, certification organizations, and other affected bodies of the European Community's plans for testing and certification of regulated and nonregulated products of non-European origin.

(2) Ways for United States manufacturers to gain acceptance of their products in the European Community and in other foreign countries and regions.

(3) The feasibility and consequences of having mutual recognition agreements between testing and certification organizations in the United States and those of major trading partners on the accreditation of testing and certification laboratories and on quality control requirements.

(4) Information coordination regarding product acceptance and conformity assessment mechanisms between the United States and foreign governments.

(5) The appropriate Federal, State, and private roles in coordination and oversight of testing, certification, accreditation, and quality control to support national and international trade.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—In selecting the members of the review panel, the National Research Council shall consult with and draw from, among others, laboratory accreditation organizations, Federal and State government agencies involved in testing and certification, professional societies, trade associations, small business, and labor organizations.

(c) REPORT.—A report based on the findings and recommendations of the review panel shall be submitted to the Secretary, the President, and Congress within 18 months after the Secretary signs the contract with the National Research Council.

SEC. 509. REPORT ON A STRATEGY TO STIMULATE COMPETITIVE RESEARCH.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No later than 120 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall submit to Congress a report presenting a proposed strategy for improving the university research capabilities of those States which historically have received relatively little Federal research and development funding. The report shall particularly—

(1) analyze recent steps to use the National Science Foundation's Experimental Program to Stimulate Competitive Research as a model for similar programs in several other Federal departments and agencies which fund research and development; and

(2) examine the feasibility and advisability of using that Program as a model for Federal research and development agencies which do not currently have similar programs.

(b) ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION.—The report shall include an analysis and discussion of—

(1) the geographic distribution of Federal research and development grants and contracts;

(2) current Federal efforts to stimulate competitive research; and

(3) the feasibility and advisability of new Federal programs to stimulate competitive research.

SEC. 510. INTERAGENCY COORDINATION.

The Secretary shall, within 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology and the Committee on Energy and Commerce of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate, a plan for coordination of Commerce Department efforts with other Federal agencies for activities related to high-resolution information systems, including research and development activities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to bring H.R. 1989, the American Technology Preeminence Act of 1991, to the floor today as one of the first acts of the 2d session of the 102d Congress. By concurring in the Senate amendments, the House today will send this bill to the White House, where I am confident it will be signed.

According to a recent poll taken by the Council on Competitiveness, pessimism about our economic standing in the world is growing, and Americans are looking to the Federal Government to play a more active role with industry in restoring America's competitiveness. Voters are concerned about their declining standard of living and are fearful about this country's economic future.

The scientific and technological programs authorized in this bill are designed to help American companies meet the challenge of competing in a global market. Indeed, this bill may well be one of the most important pieces of legislation to stimulate American competitiveness that the Congress will consider this year. Among other provisions, the bill:

Authorizes a threefold expansion of the Department of Commerce's advanced technology program, an innovative grants program aimed at promoting U.S. industrial capabilities in critical technologies;

Strengthens the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award and the Federal Laboratory Consortium for technology transfer;

Authorizes the core programs of the National Institute of Standards and Technology at a pace which will double the program over the next 5 years, thereby providing increased technological and standards development support to the Nation's high-technology industries;

Creates a National Commission on Reducing Capital Costs for Emerging Technology to help solve the capital formation problems of small high-technology businesses;

Establishes a High-Resolution Information Systems Advisory Board which is modeled after the National Advisory Commission on Semiconductors;

Directs a study of the impact of Government procurement policy on research, development, and technology utilization; and

Directs the National Academy of Sciences to study international product testing and certification issues.

These are but a few of the most important provisions of this act which will provide the starting point for a more comprehensive evaluation of and response to our competitiveness problems.

H.R. 1989 passed the House on July 16, 1991, by a wide margin—296 to 122—and an amended version of the bill passed the Senate on November 27, 1991, by unanimous consent.

The bill before you results from a concerted effort on the part of Members of the House and Senate to reach a compromise on this important legislation. As such, the bill contains a few variations from the House-passed bill which are outlined in the attachment to my floor statement. Most of these changes are deletions since it was necessary to come forward with a stripped-down version to resolve the administration's objections and clear the Senate.

For example, the fiscal year 1991 budget authorization has been removed from the bill since it is no longer relevant; instead, the bill now includes authorization for fiscal years 1992 and 1993. The funding levels authorized for these programs are consistent with the administration's agreement to double NIST's intramural budget over the next 5 years.

In addition, the $10 million Technology Commercialization Loan Program, which is designed to facilitate the commercialization of advanced technologies and help this country remain competitive, the recoupment provision in the Advanced Technology Program, and the requirement in title IV that the Vice President be among those appointed to the Commission on Reducing Capital Costs for Emerging Technologies have all been removed because of administration objections.

Other revisions have been made in negotiations with the Senate relating to the National Quality Council provisions, fire safety, and lead paint.

I do not view most of these last minute concessions as the final word on the subjects they address. We merely have gone forward with a large number of programs and policies while postponing those which are less ripe until a later time.

Mr. Speaker, the American Technology Preeminence Act is critical to America's economic growth and national security. It deserves each and every Member's strong support.

AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY PREEMINENCE ACT OF 1991—H.R. 1989, AS AMENDED—CHANGES FROM THE HOUSE-PASSED BILL

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS

The amended bill contains a "definitions" section as requested by the Senate.

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE: RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY

Technology Administration (Section 103)

A. The FY 1991 budget authorization has been removed from the bill since it is no longer relevant. The bill now includes annual authorizations of $10M for the Technology Administration for fiscal years 1992 and 1993.

B. A provision restricting the transfer of funds among Technology Administration programs and requiring advance notification to the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and the House Committee on Science, Space, and Technology has been included at the request of the Senate.

National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) (Section 104)

A. For NIST's intramural programs, the bill authorizes $210M for FY 1992, as passed by the House, and $221,200,000 for FY 1993. A facilities budget of $34,800,000 is also authorized for FY 1993.

B. The bill includes the Senate language that the fire research and building technology programs may instead of shall be combined for administrative purposes only, and requires a report to Congress no later than December 31, 1992 on the results of that combination.

C. The amended bill deletes the House-passed provision authorizing NIST and the FAA to undertake a joint research program to develop an all fire-resistant aircraft cabin interior.

D. The amended bill includes $127,500,000 annually for FY 1992 and FY 1993 for NIST's extramural programs. The amended bill also includes Senate language stipulating that funds for the extramural programs must be competitively reviewed through the merit review processes required by the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 271 et seq.). The amended bill also includes Senate language permitting NIST, as part of its continuing technology extension responsibilities, to contract with existing Regional Manufacturing Centers to provide services, and permits NIST to accept other Federal funds to provide support for the Manufacturing Centers.

E. The $10M Technology Commercialization Loan Program has been dropped and the Advanced Technology Program has been increased from $90M to $100M for FY 1992.

F. The amended bill extends the National Advisory Commission on Semiconductors through FY 1993.

G. A Senate provision requiring NIST's Director to submit a report by March 1, 1992 to the House Science, Space, and Technology Committee and the Senate Commerce, Space, and Transportation Committee on needed renovations/upgrades of NIST facilities for the next decade, including a priority list, cost estimates, and an implementation plan, is included.

TITLE II—ADVANCED TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS

A. The amended bill includes the Senate language directing the Secretary and Director to be guided by the recommendations of the Biennial National Critical Technology Reports in operating the Advanced Technology Program.

B. The provision in the House-passed bill that the Federal government recoup funds from the profits of successful joint ventures has been dropped.

C. The bill includes Senate language authorizing the Secretary and "the Director" to coordinate with other Federal officials when reviewing private sector requests for awards under the Program, and to work with the "Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy" and other Federal officials to form interagency working groups.

D. Senate language authorizing the acceptance of funds from other Federal agencies to support the Advanced Technology Program has been included in the amended bill.

TITLE III—AMENDMENTS TO THE STEVENSON-WYDLER TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION ACT OF 1980

A. In relation to Section 305, Quality Improvement, for the administration of the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award Program, the Senate language authorizing "the Director to use appropriated funds to

carry out responsibilities under this Act" has been included in the bill.

TITLE IV—NATIONAL COMMISSION ON REDUCING CAPITAL COSTS FOR EMERGING TECHNOLOGY

A. The House-passed title establishing a National Commission on Reducing Costs for Emerging Technology to develop legislative recommendations to lower the cost of capital in the United States and to increase the competitiveness of U.S. industry by encouraging investment in quality, product and process improvements, and new product development and marketing has been amended by deleting the Vice President as the chair of the Commission.

TITLE V—STUDIES AND REPORTS

A. The House-passed provision establishing a National Quality Council to set national goals and priorities has been amended to require the Secretary of Commerce rather than the President to appoint the Council, and the White House Conference on Quality Performance in the American Workplace is no longer required to be an annual event.

TITLE VI—LEAD EXPOSURE HAZARDS

A. The House provision requiring NIST to implement a voluntary accreditation program to be used in the evaluation and detection of lead in paint films, soil, and dust, and requiring NIST to establish performance criteria and standards for lead paint encapsulants and strippers has been deleted.

□ 1400

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, after 3 years of posturing and politicing, the Congress is finally going to respond to President George Bush's long-time call to invest in the future with passage of this bill.

Ever since President Bush's election in 1988, he has proposed and pushed for competitiveness research initiatives in such areas as semiconductors, superconductivity, advanced manufacturing and materials, chemical quality control, fiber optics, and other information technologies. Until today, however, Congress has not done its part by legislating on this domestic agenda.

It is quite ironic, I think, that on the very day of our President's third State of the Union Address, we will now clear for his signature a bill calling for the very domestic funding denied by the Congressional Appropriations Committees every year in the past. I must give a lot of credit in this regard to Congresswoman CONNIE MORELLA, who persisted and got the House to endorse the priority of the core program at the National Institute of Standards and Technology—its intramural in-house laboratory research. By adding language clearly stating this as Federal policy in the earlier House-passed version of this bill, we now bring back legislation for final passage that dedicates all new 1993 funding to the core program. It is the emerging technologies that the core research program supports, and technically advances, that can provide millions of good-paying, permanent American jobs in the year ahead.

Another breakthrough element of H.R. 1989 is the establishment of a blue ribbon commission to make legislative and tax recommendations to Congress within 1 short year to address the fundamental issue in international competitiveness, which is reducing the cost of capital. Congress should commit to enacting the resulting proposals, hopefully including investment credits and depreciation allowances, to spur private capital formation for the more rapid and effective commercialization of emerging technologies.

At the same time, I am quite pleased that an initial industrial policy provision has been dropped that would have made Government loans to centrally chosen companies for the development of their own commercial products. It is clearly inappropriate to tax Americans in support of private sector profits. Thanks to the support of virtually every House Republican upon initial consideration, and especially Science Committee members DON RITTER, SHERRY BOEHLERT, PAUL HENRY, DANA ROHRABACHER, and WAYNE GILCHREST, this misguided proposal has been killed, thus avoiding a veto.

I also want to commend our chairman for his willingness to drop this objectionable language and for his leadership in this process to formulate a good bill. He has been truly committed and worked very hard for its passage.

Finally, in addition to putting together a technology development bill that is both consistent with the Commerce Department's 1993 budget request and fiscally responsible by capping its grant programs at 1992 levels, Republican contributions include: Continued Federal support for the Boehlert State technology extension program; establishment of a National Quality Council by DON RITTER; and eligibility for joint production ventures, as being promoted by Judiciary and Science Committee member TOM CAMPBELL, under the Advanced Technology Program.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first step in adopting President Bush's procompetitiveness policy, and I wholeheartedly urge its unanimous adoption. But the balance of the President's national policy blueprint, including a permanent R&D tax credit, reduced capital gains rates, antitrust protection of joint production ventures, and product liability reform, will greatly reduce costs, legal uncertainty, and regulatory burdens. This comprehensive agenda is genuinely bold, and will create jobs, higher wages, and better, cheaper products. Let us, in this Congress, put the American people ahead of politics and act.

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

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS].

□ 1410

Mr. LEWIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1989, the American Technology Preeminence Act, as amended. This bill will assist the United States in its drive to become more competitive in the world marketplace.

This bill is very similar to legislation that passed the House late last year.

H.R. 1989, as amended, provides funding for the Department of Commerce's Technology Administration and the National Institute of Standards and Technology, known as NIST, including the Advanced Technology Program.

The Advanced Technology Program was created by legislation in 1988, to assist private enterprise in developing and marketing new technologies. This is an area in which it is extremely important for our Nation to stress if we are to truly be competitive. Other countries, most notably Japan, have programs of this nature.

The April 1991 Office of Science and Technology Policy report entitled "National Critical Technologies," concluded that the key to future U.S. competitiveness involves a fundamental change in the way U.S. industry competes in the marketplace.

In addition, H.R. 1989, as amended, contains funding for other long-neglected programs which would enhance U.S. manufacturing technology and continue the Malcolm Baldrige Quality Award Program.

To conclude, H.R. 1989, as amended, could not have reached the floor without the leadership and support of the committee chairman, BROWN and ranking member, WALKER.

I also want to congratulate the subcommittee chairman, Mr. VALENTINE, for his hard work and guidance on this legislation, and certainly the gentlewoman from Maryland for her hard work on this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is a good first step in correcting many of our Nation's competitiveness ills, so I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1989, as amended, the American Technology Preeminence Act.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the conference report on H.R. 1989, the American Technology Preeminence Act. I have had the pleasure of supporting this bill in hearings on the subcommittee and committee levels, and on the House floor.

In these times of a global economy, American social and economic prosperity cannot be separated from technological preeminence. Government policies must play an active role in creating an economic environment in which new technologies are developed, perfected, and marketed worldwide.

The American Technology Preeminence Act is designed to advance American global competitivenss. H.R. 1989 broadly aids the economy, committing significant new Federal moneys—not to just one industry or tech-

nology—but to wide-ranging high-technology research, development, and procurement.

Also, H.R. 1989 greatly increases funding to the National Institute of Standards and Technology [NIST]. As the primary Federal Agency concerned with manufacturing, NIST has helped spur an American manufacturing renaissance that has brought quality American products and processes to the world.

NIST's competitiveness is a reflection of our own national competitiveness. Indeed, in our subcommittee hearings, Dr. John McTague, vice president of Ford Motor Co. cited NIST as a "crown jewel on which industry justifiably relies." As the flagship laboratory in applying U.S. science and technology to the marketplace, NIST acts as an invaluable ally to American private industry.

The American Technology Preeminence Act allocates $166 million directly to NIST in fiscal year 1991, and $210 million in fiscal year 1992. The act also directs an additional $117 million to NIST for extramural programs in fiscal year 1991 and $127 million in fiscal year 1992.

These dollars earmarked for NIST are invested in cutting-edge research in areas such as electronics, computers, communications, and industrial chemical technology and manufacturing. Spanning the spectrum from aircraft fire research to lead exposure studies to educational and pilot programs, this investment goes a long way in ensuring America's technological leadership in many areas of public health, safety, and the environment.

This act is a model of responsible Government spending. Not only does it make a significant, cost-effective commitment to American competitiveness, it also mandates buy-American provisions, strict cost accountability, and meticulous oversight mechanisms.

So many people have made important contributions in crafting this legislation and moving it forward—my colleagues on the Space, Science, and Technology Committee and their dedicated staffs, the many research and industry people who testified at the numerous hearings, and the dedicated professionals at both the Technology Administration of the Commerce Department and the National Institute of Standards and Technology.

I strongly support this legislation and look forward to its passage into law.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER].

Mr. RITTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1989, the American Technology Preeminence Act. I commend the Science, Space, and Technology Committee chairman, Mr. BROWN, ranking Republican member, Mr. WALKER, the subcommittee chairman, Mr. VALENTINE, and ranking Republican, Mr. LEWIS, for their hard work in developing this bill.

This bill reflects an emerging consensus in Congress and the administration of the need for a stronger Federal effort in technologies critical to our Nation's future competitiveness and the creation of jobs for our workers.

It is a significant step toward reorienting the Federal research and development and technology establishment toward critical needs in our private sector, toward that economic battleground worldwide so much focused on technology.

The technology initiatives contained in this bill can provide American companies with the technological advantage needed to compete more effectively against their often well-financed, government-supported foreign competitors.

Manufacturing is an essential yet often overlooked component of America's economic foundation. Furthermore, when we talk about the competitiveness of industry in this country, we are talking most fundamentally about manufacturing industry. Manufacturing is the primary link between the U.S. economy and the rest of the world, and is the sector of our economy most exposed to foreign competition. Eighty percent of our exports are merchandise exports, mainly manufactured products—315 billion dollars' worth of exports and millions of jobs.

As the primary Federal agency concerned with manufacturing, NIST has played an important role in the ongoing renaissance in American manufacturing. Continued support for this effort is vital.

Manufacturing really is the crown jewel of a modern industrial society. All of our major competitors know this. They nurture their manufacturing industries as if they were crown jewels. Too often we treat ours, the Federal Government and State governments treat ours, as some kind of millstone. We neglect the importance of manufacturing at our own peril.

The bill strengthens NIST's Advanced Technology Program, ATP. As a founder of the ATP, I believe the technological collaboration and innovation that will spur is essential both in the ability of the United States to compete, and, ultimately in determining the living standards of all Americans.

Yet even at the funding level contemplated by this bill, the Advanced Technology Program would still be a modest effort compared to similar programs of many of our major competitors.

The bottom line is that our American producers have made tremendous progress, but that the target is moving out there. To be great, American manufacturing is going to have to engage in a great deal of collaboration. This bill spurs collaboration amongst American industry.

People talk about things like flexible manufacturing. Now we hear the term "agile manufacturing."

□ 1420

This is all about companies getting together and maybe not for all time but to do things in the marketplace, to get in, to get out. And this bill helps to stimulate that collaborative mode which I think we need to admit the United States is not that accustomed to.

The bill contains provisions designed to address other competitiveness problems. It creates a high-resolution information systems board as well as a commission to examine the impact of the high cost of capital on American companies. Whether it increases quality or whether it is advanced technology, all of this is a long-range deal, manufacturing itself is a long-range proposition. And we need to be very, very firmly knowledgeable about our cost of capital versus our competitors and, of course, how to lower the cost of capital, how to make it easier to invest in the future of America, the future of American manufacturing.

Finally, the bill contains my legislation for establishing a national quality council to give national focus to the efforts to promote quality in America. The national quality council would help establish goals and priorities for quality in all major sectors of our economy, including private industry, government and education. When we think about the debate in recent weeks following President Bush's trip to Japan, it is quality in so many different ways, quality of our products, quality of our production, our workers' quality, management quality. This debate has hit a fever pitch, and in this bill we set up a national council to see where America is, where it is in this revolution to make workers far more competitive, and we evaluate where America is after periods of time. There is a White House conference on quality.

We seek to set goals, goals for America to attain higher levels of quality. Membership on the council would include leading quality luminaries with broad ties to the increasingly, rapidly growing community of quality organizations and practitioners.

The national quality council would be a focal point for bringing together the foot soldiers of America's quality revolution. We cannot mandate quality. We cannot set a one-size-fits-all standard.

But through the leadership of the quality council, we can try to create a climate that encourages the pursuit of perfection. Indeed, a culture of quality.

H.R. 1989 is an essential component of the Federal effort to promote the

competitiveness of American industry and American workers. It also lays the groundwork for an increase in the number of high-value added, well-paying American jobs and Made in the USA.

The American Technology Preeminence Act represents a sound investment in our future economic well-being, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Ms. HORN].

Ms. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, the Senate amendments to the American Technology Preeminence Act.

This bill is very similar to the legislation passed by the Science, Space, and Technology Committee early last year and by the House last July. Although it does not contain the language to authorize loans for the commercialization of technology included in the House bill, as I would have preferred, it retains the other provisions important to helping the Commerce Department, through the National Institutes of Standards and Technology [NIST], move ahead in their technology programs.

We as a Nation must move forward in promoting advances in manufacturing the critical technology areas. This legislation represents a first step in helping NIST to aid our industries. It is also a continuation of Congress' initiative in increasing investment in our civilian sector. Since 1989, congressional leaders have called for improving the competitiveness of our manufacturing and industrial sector. The Advanced Technology Program [ATP], as well as other NIST programs, are a start in rebuilding our industries. In the world's new competitive climate, we must build on this progress so that all our domestic industries can produce quality products for domestic sales and export. This is a positive step to preserve and create good American jobs. It is an important step as we convert our large military sector to civilian commercial use.

In addition, this bill contains authorization for both fiscal year 1992 and fiscal year 1993. This is a good idea. I support multiyear authorizations of programs wherever feasible because they encourage longer term planning. Such multiyear planning is essential to sustain support of industrial growth and investment. This 2-year authorization represents a step in the direction of longer term commitments to industry and has my wholehearted support.

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, before I yield back the balance of my time, I yield myself 2 minutes simply to say in conclusion I express my appreciation and personal thanks to the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], chairman of the committee, and to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALKER], the ranking member of the full Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. LEWIS], the ranking Republican member of our subcommittee, and to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RITTER] and others who have shown interest in this matter.

This represents, I believe, a truly bipartisan effort on the part of both Democrats and Republicans on the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology to begin to initiate in the Congress legislation that will turn the competitiveness issue into a solution that can get America back on the track.

I believe that we will come to recognize, as I said earlier, this is one of the most important pieces of legislation adopted by the 102d Congress.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1989, the American Technology Preeminence Act of 1991, as amended by the Senate. This legislation can have a significant positive impact on the future of the American economy. It is a very appropriate bill to be clearing for the President at a time when interest in the competitiveness of U.S. industry has never been higher.

The American Technology Preeminence Act is a broad-based bill which takes many important steps towards revitalizing U.S. manufacturing capabilities and nurturing U.S. high-technology companies.

The bill provides increased funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology's [NIST] core research programs which support this country's industrial base.

It authorizes funding for key competitiveness programs of the Department of Commerce, such as the advanced technology program, which helps American companies in developing generic technologies with commercial promise.

The bill sets up a bipartisan commission charged with examining ways to deal with the high cost of capital that U.S. industry must pay and a commission to look into ways to advance U.S. high technology through changes in Government procurement policies.

It establishes a high resolution information systems board to bring together industry and government leaders to build the technology base for a U.S. high-resolution information systems industry. These technologies will be among the world's most important in the next century.

Other provisions of the bill include amendments to the Stevenson-Wydler Act to encourage the transfer of technology from our national laboratories to the private sector, authorization of studies to address technology policy issues, and the establishment of a national quality council to set national goals for quality performance in all sectors of the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the scientific and technological programs authorized in this important legislation are essential to maintaining U.S. preeminence as a leader in an increasingly technological world. I urge my colleagues to support the American Technology Preeminence Act of 1991.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate amendments to the American Technology Preeminence Act. I congratulate my colleagues, Chairman BROWN and Chairman VALENTINE for their hard work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, we must make technological leadership a national priority. We must confront the challenges that we will face during the 1990's and beyond.

Although the American Technology Preeminence Act will help us to achieve this goal, I am disappointed because the Senate version of the bill before us today is, in fact, a compromise that does not include a very important provision that was approved by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, small companies are our laboratories for the new technologies that our Nation will need in the future.

But today, these same small companies face great barriers when bringing their ideas to the marketplace and commercializing their innovations.

The House version of the American Technology Preeminence Act contained an amendment that I offered to help support U.S. businesses in the increasingly competitive world market.

The provision, the Technology Commercialization Loan Program, would have provided low-cost capital to help high-technology companies overcome the tremendous barriers they face in raising capital.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, this provision is no longer in the bill.

The administration opposed the Technology Commercialization Loan Program so vehemently that it had to be deleted for the bill to survive.

Mr. Speaker, high-technology and electronics industries are driving the global economy. Our future will be determined by how well we compete in these industries into the next century. Our competitors in Europe and the Pacific rim understand this, which is why they have invested so heavily in these industries.

In the United States, however, the President talks about growth, but fails to take action. Meanwhile, the economy falters and the unemployment rates continue to rise.

The Technology Commercialization Loan Program was strongly supported by numerous leading industry associations. Despite overwhelming support, however, the administration opposed the provision.

Very soon I will introduce the Technology Commercialization Loan Program as a standalone bill that will provide patient, low-cost capital to help U.S. companies move ideas from the lab to the marketplace. Senator ROCKEFELLER, who supported the amendment last year, will introduce the measure in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, our economic future depends on promoting our critical high-technology industries. The bill that I will introduce in the House and that Senator ROCKEFELLER will introduce in the Senate to provide technology commercialization loans will foster these critical industries.

Until the administration recognizes the value of our critical high-technology industries, our Nation will continue to lose economic ground

to our competitors. Americans need more from the administration than just talk about economic growth—they need action. Technology commercialization loans will provide such action.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1989, the American Technology Preeminence Act, as amended.

In the next decade and beyond, no other factor contributing to our Nation's economic growth will be more important than our ability to translate scientific knowledge into improved methods of production. For decades we have been the world leader in basic research. Yet we have failed to devote equal resources to the application of that research. The legislation before us will help reverse that.

However, I want to remind my colleagues on the floor today that we aren't going far enough with this proposal. Germany and Japan have increased the share of their GNP's devoted to commercialization to 2.8 percent and 2.6 percent respectively. In the past 20 years, the United States has only devoted 1.3 percent of GNP to such activity.

I am greatly discouraged that the Senate amendment freezes the funding levels for the NIST extramural programs—particularly the Advanced Technology Program [ATP] which awards technology development grants to commercial firms. Why, at a time when the Carnegie Commission on Science and Technology recommends increasing ATP's budget to about half of the total NIST budget itself, do we want to freeze spending for this crucial program? This program could very well be deemed the jobs creation program of the 1990's.

I am also disappointed that an agreement couldn't be worked out on the commercialization loan issue. And for the record, I want to clarify my position. In committee, I supported the rather modest Mineta commercialization loan proposal. In fact, I continue to believe that it is time for our Federal Government to directly support private sector commercialization efforts. However, when the bill reached the House floor, it was apparent that the loan provision would kill the overall NIST authorization and threaten other vital advanced technology programs. Additionally, the loan proposal became entrenched in partisan bickering when the majority leader interjected himself into the debate. Therefore, I opposed the Mineta amendment on the floor.

Although a commercialization loan program will not be part of the legislation we are considering today, I want to remind my colleagues that it is an issue we need to revisit. The cost and risk of bringing a product to commercialization stages often prevent companies from doing so. It's no longer a matter of picking winners and losers. It's a matter of creating or not creating jobs.

Call it what you will, but this country needs an industrial policy. And the American Technology Preeminence Act establishes a base from which we should move forward in this regard.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1989.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. VALENTINE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1989.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules.

Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed today, in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

House Concurrent Resolution 268, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 1989, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic votes after the first such vote on this series.

□ 1430

AUTHORIZING CORRECTIONS IN ENROLLMENT OF H.R. 3866, FLOWER GARDEN BANKS NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 268.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONES] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 268, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 390, nays 0, not voting 44, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]

YEAS—390

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allard
Allen
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Atkins
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Campbell (CO)
Cardin
Carper
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Darden
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
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
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
Lancaster
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Owens (NY)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Penny
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Pursell

Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wolf
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—44

Aspin
AuCoin
Bustamante
Carr
Coleman (TX)
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
de la Garza
Dellums
Donnelly
Dooley
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
English
Feighan
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Hochbrueckner
Jefferson
Kleczka
Lantos
Lent
Levine (CA)
Lloyd
McCurdy
McDade
Miller (WA)
Morrison
Mrazek
Nagle
Oakar
Olin
Owens (UT)
Porter
Ridge
Sabo
Scheuer
Schiff
Swett
Tauzin
Torricelli
Wise
Wolpe
Young (AK)

□ 1454

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCNULTY). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, the Chair announces he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings on today.

AMERICAN TECHNOLOGY PREEMINENCE ACT OF 1991

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and concurring in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1989.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. VALENTINE] that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 1989, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 1, not voting 41, as follows:

[Roll No. 3]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allard
Allen
Anderson
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Annunzio
Anthony
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Atkins
Bacchus
Baker
Ballenger
Barnard
Barrett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bennett
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackwell
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Boxer
Brewster
Brooks
Broomfield
Browder
Brown
Bruce
Bryant
Bunning
Burton
Byron
Callahan
Camp
Campbell (CA)
Cardin
Carper
Carr
Chandler
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Clinger
Coble
Coleman (MO)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooper
Costello
Coughlin
Cox (CA)
Cox (IL)
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Darden
Davis
DeFazio
DeLauro
DeLay
Derrick
Dickinson
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doolittle
Dorgan (ND)
Dornan (CA)
Downey
Dreier
Duncan
Durbin
Dwyer
Early
Eckart
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Emerson
Engel
Erdreich
Espy
Evans
Ewing
Fascell
Fawell
Fazio
Fields
Fish
Flake
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Franks (CT)
Frost
Gallegly
Gallo
Gaydos
Gejdenson
Gekas
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
Hatcher
Hayes (IL)
Hayes (LA)
Hefley
Hefner
Henry
Herger
Hertel
Hoagland
Hobson
Holloway
Hopkins
Horn
Horton
Houghton
Hoyer
Hubbard
Huckaby
Hughes
Hunter
Hutto
Hyde
Inhofe
Ireland
Jacobs
James
Jenkins
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Johnston
Jones (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jontz
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kleczka
Klug
Kolbe
Kolter
Kopetski
Kostmayer
Kyl
LaFalce
Lagomarsino
LaRocco
Laughlin
Leach
Lehman (CA)
Lehman (FL)
Levin (MI)
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (FL)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Lipinski
Livingston
Lloyd
Long
Lowery (CA)
Lowey (NY)
Luken
Machtley
Manton
Markey
Marlenee
Martin
Martinez
Matsui
Mavroules
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McEwen
McGrath
McHugh
McMillan (NC)
McMillen (MD)
McNulty
Meyers
Mfume
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (OH)
Mineta
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moody
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Morrison
Murphy
Murtha
Myers
Nagle
Natcher
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nichols
Nowak
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Orton
Owens (NY)
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Panetta
Parker
Pastor
Patterson
Paxon
Payne (NJ)
Payne (VA)
Pease
Pelosi
Perkins
Peterson (FL)
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Poshard
Price
Pursell
Quillen
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Ray
Reed
Regula
Rhodes
Richardson
Ridge
Riggs
Rinaldo
Ritter
Roberts
Roe
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rose
Rostenkowski
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal
Russo
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Sarpalius
Savage
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schroeder
Schulze
Schumer
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shuster
Sikorski
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slattery
Slaughter
Smith (FL)
Smith (IA)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solarz
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Staggers
Stallings
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Studds
Stump
Sundquist
Swift
Synar
Tallon
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (GA)
Thomas (WY)
Thornton
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Traxler
Unsoeld
Upton
Valentine
Vander Jagt
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Walsh
Washington
Waters
Waxman
Weber
Weiss
Weldon
Wheat
Whitten
Williams
Wilson
Wolpe
Wyden
Wylie
Yates
Yatron
Young (FL)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—1

Penny

NOT VOTING—41

Aspin
AuCoin
Bustamante
Campbell (CO)
Coleman (TX)
Cunningham
Dannemeyer
de la Garza
Dellums
Donnelly
Dooley
Dymally
Edwards (OK)
English
Feighan
Frank (MA)
Hastert
Hochbrueckner
Jefferson
Lancaster
Lantos
Lent
Levine (CA)
McCurdy
McDade
Miller (WA)
Mrazek
Oakar
Olin
Ortiz
Owens (UT)
Porter
Sabo
Scheuer
Schiff
Swett
Tauzin
Torricelli
Wise
Wolf
Young (AK)

□ 1508

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate amendment was concurred in.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1330

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1330.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am dismayed that the bells did not ring in my office announcing rollcall votes and I was not present and voting on rollcall Nos. 2 and 3.

I was meeting in my office with three Israeli immigrants and no bells were heard until five rang, at which point I advised my visitors that I would have to go to vote and quickly wound up our conversation. I then turned on my TV to see how much time was left in the vote and found the floor clock showing that all time had expired.

The bells have never failed to ring before, but my failure to vote on these two rollcalls was unavoidable. I have asked that the clocks in my office be immediately repaired so that this will never happen again.

Had I been present and voting on these two rollcalls, I would have voted "aye" in each instance.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, on the previous vote I was conducting a hearing of the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology Subcommittee in room 2318 of the Rayburn Building. Mr. Speaker, the bells did not go off in our hearing room.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I missed the vote, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLPE] and the gentleman from the State of Washington [Mr. MORRISON] also missed the vote.

Mr. Speaker, had we been present, we would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WOLPE. Mr. Speaker, if it is necessary, I independently indicate that I would have voted "aye" if I had been present at the last vote. The bells did not function in our committee room.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3769

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3769.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 194

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 194.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1510

INTRODUCTION OF RTC CLARIFICATION BILL

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, a gentleman stood up during a health care town meeting that I hosted, and told me that he was losing his health insurance coverage because the savings and loan that he had retired from, failed. He said that he would be able to continue his health care coverage for 3 months, at the exorbitant and unaffordable cost of over $1,700.

It appears as if employees of this savings and loan and others who may fail in the future, will not be able to continue their health insurance coverage as intended by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the town meeting that I held, was one of 285 held throughout the country by my Democratic colleagues in the House. While Members on both sides of the aisle make decisions about how to best address health care concerns, how can we not be responsive to the over 700 employees of Perpetual Savings Bank who have not only lost their jobs but who may be in jeopardy of having their health insurance lapse while the RTC tries to duck their responsibility.

In just a short period of time terminal illnesses can be diagnosed, women can become pregnant, and children with congenital defects can be born. None of these conditions would be picked up by a subsequent insurance provider because they would be considered preexisting conditions. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this is not consistent with congressional intent.

Mr. Speaker, when Congress passed the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991, it was clear that there was no distinction between the Resolution Trust Corporation and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation as receiver.

I am introducing legislation today, that tells RTC in no uncertain terms, that they have the same obligation as the FDIC to provide a group health plan to former employees of failed banks and thrifts meeting Employee Retirement Income Security Act [ERISA] requirements. This law is not subject to interpretation, and is in fact, law.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DERRICK). The Chair will now recognize Members for special orders until 5:30 p.m., at which time the Chair will declare the House in recess.

TEMPORARY INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT RESTORATION ACT OF 1992

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

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, in order to spur industrial growth and expansion and produce an early turnaround in our stagnant economy, I introduce today the Temporary Investment Tax Credit Restoration Act of 1992. This legislation will reinstate the 10-percent investment tax credit on an incremental basis for 2 years, retroactive to January 1, 1992. In offering this proposal on behalf of myself and Representatives BAKER, DOOLITTLE, RAMSTAD, HORTON, BLAZ, PACKARD, HUNTER, LOWERY, and LAGOMARSINO, I join many economists and businessmen in urging an immediate short-term stimulus to the economy which will encourage American industry and agriculture to build for the future and enable this country to compete better in the global economy.

With our economy still in recession, we must take prompt and sensible measures to stimulate national recovery and improve our competitive position in world trade. Insufficient investment is certainly one underlying cause for our economy's sluggish productivity growth and declining competitiveness. Investment spending in Japan, for example, where the economy is just over one-half that of the United States, is a much greater share of that nation's GNP than investment spending in the United States. U.S. investment in productive manufacturing equipment has fallen from an average increase of 4 to 5 percent during the 1950's, 1960's and 1970's to just 1.6 percent for the 1980's. American industry must retool now for the technology explosion, job growth, and competitive global expansion of the 1990's and beyond.

Evidence shows that the investment credit does indeed raise investment spending. According to the American Council for Capital Formation, purchases of equipment by industry have grown far faster during periods when the credit was in effect than when it wasn't. An investment tax credit has been enacted three times since January 1962. It was initiated under the Kennedy administration as a means of sparking economic recovery after a recession, and it worked. As a permanent credit, it was eliminated finally in the 1986 tax reform effort amidst criticisms that it created distortions in investment decisions. During that period, however, the credit was an effective cyclical stabilizer and a powerful investment stimulus.

I propose that the credit be revived for 2 years so that it will provide what economist Robert Eisner calls "a big bang for the buck" without excessive costs or long-term distortions. Companies will be encouraged to accelerate their spending, rather than to put off plans for industrial expansion, thereby giving the economy a quick start and wage earners and consumers a psychological boost. Although estimates of its immediate cost vary, its intermediate-range impact will be to produce millions in tax revenues emanating from the recovery it helps to engender and the additional jobs it will spawn. Moreover, the cost of the credit will be reduced by making it apply only to a company's investment in man-

ufacturing and other productive equipment properties, including farm equipment and computer software, that exceeds its previous spending on such equipment over the previous 4-year base amount. If in 2 years the economy still needs a strong shot in the arm, the credit can be extended or again be made permanent as it was until 1986.

Mr. Speaker, our economy is in trouble, and the American people remain pessimistic about it and their future. A temporary incremental investment tax credit will provide the push that industry and consumer need. The time for action, rather than partisan politics, is long overdue. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and the House to approve the 10-percent investment tax credit now.

Let's make the investment tax credit part of our campaign to jump start America.

THE ASSASSINATION OF JOHN F. KENNEDY

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

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I sent a Dear Colleague letter to my colleagues in the House expressing my concern for the letters and telephone calls which have recently been generated by media interest and concern over the records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy. As the former chairman of the House Select Committee on Assassinations, I want my colleagues to know my position on this matter.

The House Select Committee on Assassinations was constituted on September 17, 1976, during the second session of the 94th Congress. Its original chairman was Thomas N. Downing who retired at the end of that Congress. The committee was recreated on February 2, 1977, during the 95th Congress with Congressman HENRY GONZALEZ being appointed as its new chairman. Shortly thereafter, he resigned the chairmanship and on March 8, 1977, I was appointed to chair this committee.

Under the House resolution creating this committee, we were authorized and directed to: "* * * conduct a full and complete investigation surrounding the assassination and death of President John F. Kennedy * * *."

Our committee completed its investigation and on March 29, 1979, filed a final report with the House of Representatives.

In addition to the final report, 12 volumes of evidentiary material relating to this investigation were filed with the House of Representatives, printed by the Government Printing Office, and then made available to the American public.

Moreover, in our public presentation of the evidence, we held approximately 18 days of public hearings from August through December 1978, as well as 2 days of public policy hearings. During the public hearings, the committee received evidence on the issues we had identified to fulfill the legislative mandate.

Evidence was heard on the following: First, the facts and circumstances surrounding the death of President Kennedy, and the connection if any between President Kennedy, those facts and circumstances and the accused assassin, Lee Harvey Oswald; second, the question of whether there was a conspiracy in the case; and third, the performance of the various Federal agencies including the FBI, the CIA, the Secret Service, the Warren Commission, and others.

Prior to our committee running out of both time and money, we released everything we had the time and resources to release. All of our other records were placed in the National Archives under a House of Representatives rule requiring such unpublished records to be sealed for 50 years.

There is considerable public debate about these records including accusations that these records, if released, would contain evidence of Government coverup or complicity of Government agencies in the assassination of President Kennedy. I can assure my colleagues that nothing could be further from the truth.

However, I deem it important to not have the good work of our committee impugned by such accusations. Our committee attempted to conduct its investigation into the assassination of the President and to present the results of that investigation to the Congress and the American people in a thorough and dignified manner in keeping with the memory of this great leader. Accordingly, I am in the process of drafting a resolution which will affect the release of these and other documents now under seal bearing upon the assassination of President Kennedy. Properly drafting such a resolution is taking time because it involves both House and Senate records, as well as the records of other Government agencies. This process involves a fairly complicated area of record designation.

I am committed to the principle that Americans are entitled to know the truth about the assassination of President Kennedy and feel that Congress should totally allay all fears of the American people in this regard.

It is my intention to seek original cosponsors of my resolution as soon as it is prepared. I hope that all of my colleagues will provide me with the opportunity to seek their support at that time.

□ 1520

CURRENT LEVEL OF SPENDING AND REVENUES FOR FISCAL YEARS 1992–1996

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, on behalf of the Committee on the Budget and as chairman of the Committee on the Budget, pursuant to the procedures of the Committee on the Budget and section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as amended, I am submitting for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the official letter to the Speaker advising him of the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 and spending for fiscal year 1992. Spending levels for fiscal years 1993 through 1996 are not included because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

This is the second report of the 102d Congress for fiscal year 1992. This report is based on the aggregate levels and committee allocations for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 as contained in House Report 102–69, the conference report to accompany House Concurrent Resolution 121.

The term "current level" refers to the estimated amount of budget authority, outlays, entitlement authority, and revenues that are available—or will be used—for the full fiscal year in question based only on enacted law.

As chairman of the Budget Committee, I intend to keep the House informed regularly on the status of the current level.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, January 28, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: To facilitate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, I am herewith transmitting the status report on the current level of revenues for fiscal years 1992 through 1996 and spending estimates for fiscal year 1992, under H. Con. Res. 121, the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 1992. Spending levels for fiscal years 1993 through 1996 are not included because annual appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

The enclosed tables also compare enacted legislation to each committee's 602(a) allocation of discretionary new budget authority and new entitlement authority. The 602(a) allocations to House Committees made pursuant to H. Con. Res. 121 were printed in the statement of managers accompanying the conference report on the resolution (H. Report 102–69).

Sincerely,

LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

REPORT TO THE SPEAKER OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES FROM THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET ON THE STATUS OF THE FISCAL YEAR 1992 CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET ADOPTED IN H. CON. RES. 121

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF JANUARY 22, 1992

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years	
	1992	1992–1996
Appropriate level:		
Budget authority	1,269,300	6,591,900
Outlays	1,201,600	6,134,100
Revenues	850,400	4,832,000
Current level:		
Budget authority	1,274,190	NA

REFLECTING COMPLETED ACTION AS OF JANUARY 22, 1992—Continued

[On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars]

	Fiscal years	
	1992	1992–1996
Outlays	1,204,743	NA
Revenues	853,364	4,829,000
Current level over(+)/under(−) appropriate level:		
Budget authority	+4,890	NA
Outlays	+3,143	NA
Revenues	+2,964	−3,000

NA—Not applicable because annual Appropriations acts for those years have not been enacted.

BUDGET AUTHORITY

Any measure that provides new budget or entitlement authority, that is not included in the current level estimate for fiscal year 1992, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of budget authority for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121, to be exceeded.

OUTLAYS

Any measure that provides new budget or entitlement authority, that is not included in the current level estimate for fiscal 1992, if adopted and enacted, would cause the appropriate level of outlays for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121, to be exceeded.

REVENUES

Any measure that would result in a revenue loss that is not included in the current level revenue estimate and exceeds $2,964 million for fiscal year 1992, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for that year as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121. Any measure that would result in a revenue loss that is not included in the current level revenue estimate for fiscal years 1992 through 1996, if adopted and enacted, would cause revenues to be less than the appropriate level for those years as set forth in H. Con. Res. 121.

DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION

[Fiscal years, in millions of dollars]

House Committee	1992			1992–96		
	BA	OLS	NEA	BA	OLS	NEA
Agriculture:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	3,720	3,540	4,716
Current level	−2	−2	−1	−1	−1	(1)
Difference	−2	−2	−1	−3,719	−3,539	−4,716
Armed Services:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	−7	−7	0	−83	−83
Difference		−7	−7		−83	−83
Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	28	28	0	177	177	0
Difference	+28	+28		+177	+177	
District of Columbia:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Education and Labor:						
Appropriate level	0	0	56	0	0	20,153
Current level	−46	−46	0	0	4	0
Difference	−46	−46	−56		+4	−20,153
Energy and Commerce:						
Appropriate level	−46	−46	−56	0	+4	−20,153
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Foreign Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Government Operations:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
House Administration:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Interior and Insular Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	−2	−2	0	5	5	0
Difference	−2	−2		+5	+5	
Judiciary:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	16	16	16
Difference				+16	+16	+16
Merchant Marine and Fisheries:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	(1)	0	0	(1)
Difference			(1)			(1)
Post Office and Civil Service:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Public Works and Transportation:						
Appropriate level	16,358	0	0	117,799	0	0
Current level	18,514	0	0	113,048	0	0
Difference	+2,156	0	0	−4,751	0	0
Science, Space, and Technology:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Small Business:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Difference						
Veterans' Affairs:						
Appropriate level	0	0	484	0	0	6,811
Current level	0	5	378	0	19	2,182
Difference	0	+5	−106	0	+19	−4,629
Ways and Means:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	620
Current level	4,330	4,330	5,430	4,152	4,152	5,892
Difference	+4,330	+4,330	+5,430	+4,152	+4,152	+5,272
Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence:						
Appropriate level	0	0	0	0	0	0
Current level	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Difference	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)

[1] Less than $500,000.

DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 1992

[In millions of dollars]

	Revised 602(b) subdivisions		Latest current level		Difference	
	BA	O	BA	O	BA	O
Commerce-Justice-State-Judiciary	21,070	20,714	21,029	20,708	−41	−6
Defense	270,244	275,222	269,860	275,038	−384	−184
District of Columbia	700	690	700	690	0	0
Energy & Water Development	21,875	20,770	21,875	20,720	0	−50
Foreign Operations	15,285	13,556	14,262	13,200	−1,023	−356
Interior	13,102	12,050	13,105	12,198	3	148
Labor, Health & Human Services, & Education	59,087	57,797	59,085	57,832	−2	35
Legislative	2,344	2,317	2,343	2,310	−1	−7
Military Construction	8,564	8,482	8,563	8,433	−1	−49
Rural Development, Agriculture, & Related Agencies	12,299	11,226	12,299	11,223	0	−3
Transportation	13,765	31,800	13,762	31,799	−3	−1
Treasury-Postal Service	10,825	11,120	10,824	11,119	−1	−1
VA-HUD-Independent Agencies	63,953	61,714	63,942	61,711	−11	−3
Grand total	513,113	527,458	511,649	526,981	−1,464	−477

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, January 22, 1992.

Hon. LEON E. PANETTA,
Chairman, Committee on the Budget, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Pursuant to section 308(b) and in aid of section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act, as amended, this letter and supporting detail provide an up-to-date tabulation of the on-budget current levels of new budget authority, estimated outlays, and estimated revenues in comparison with the appropriate levels for those items contained in the 1992 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget (H. Con. Res. 121). This report, my first for the 2d session of the 102d Congress, is tabulated as of close of business January 21, 1992. A summary of this tabulation follows.

[In millions of dollars]

	House current level	Budget resolution (H. Con. Res. 121)	Current level +/− resolution
Budget authority	1,274,190	1,269,300	+4,890
Outlays	1,204,743	1,201,600	+3,143
Revenues:			
1992	853,364	850,400	+2,964
1992–96	4,829,000	4,832,000	−3,000

Sincerely,

ROBERT D. REISCHAUER,
Director.

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 102D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992

[As of close of business Jan. 21, 1992]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
ENACTED PRIOR TO 102d CONGRESS			
Revenues			850,405
Permanent appropriations	784,794	723,520	
Outlays from prior year appropriations	0	234,906	
Offsetting receipts	(186,675)	(186,675)	
Total previously enacted	598,120	771,751	850,405
ENACTED 1ST SESSION			
Appropriation legislation:			
Agriculture (P.L. 102–142)	51,219	36,382	
Commerce-Justice (P.L. 102–140)	21,425	16,016	
Offsetting receipts	(119)	(119)	
Defense (P.L. 102–172)	269,911	176,492	
District of Columbia (P.L. 102–111)	700	690	
Energy and Water (P.L. 102–104)	21,875	12,961	
Interior (P.L. 102–154)	12,466	8,098	
Labor, HHS, Education (P.L. 102–170)	183,044	146,857	
Offsetting receipts	(39,658)	(39,658)	
Legislative branch (P.L. 102–90)	2,309	2,063	
Military construction (P.L. 102–136)	8,563	2,931	

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 102D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[As of close of business Jan. 21, 1992]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
Transportation (P.L. 102–143)	14,302	12,217	
Treasury-Postal Service (P.L. 102–141)	19,695	17,027	
Offsetting receipts	(6,079)	(6,079)	
Veterans, HUD (P.L. 102–139)	80,941	42,469	
Emergency supplemental for humanitarian Assistance (P.L. 102–55)		(1)	
Dire emergency supplemental appropriations, 1991 (P.L. 102–27)		511	
Disaster relief supplemental appropriations, 1992 (P.L. 102–229)	113	(154)	
Other spending legislation:			
Extending IRS deadline for Desert Storm troops (P.L. 102–2)			(5)
Veterans' education, employment and training amendments (P.L. 102–16)	(1)	(1)	
Higher education technical amendments (P.L. 102–26)	(56)	(56)	
Veterans' Health Care Personnel Act (P.L. 102–40)		(1)	
Veterans' housing and memorial affairs (P.L. 102–54)		5	
Veterans' Benefits Improvement Act (P.L. 102–86)	(2)	(2)	
Intelligence Authorization Act, fiscal year 1991 (P.L. 102–88)	(1)	(1)	(1)
Veterans' educational assistance amendments (P.L. 102–127)		(1)	
Extend Most Favored Nation status to Bulgaria (P.L. 102–158)			(2)
Unemployment compensation (P.L. 102–164)	3,825	3,825	2,600
Provide MFN status to Czechoslovakia and Hungary (P.L. 102–182)	505	505	(17)
Intelligence Authorization Act, fiscal year 1992 (P.L. 102–183)	(1)	(1)	
Defense Authorization Act (P.L. 102–190)		(7)	
Extend MFN status to the Soviet Union (P.L. 102–197)			(22)
James Madison Memorial Act (P.L. 102–221)		(1)	
Tax Extension Act (P.L. 102–227)			405
San Carolos Indian Irrigation Project Divestiture Act (P.L. 102–231)	(2)	(2)	
RTC Refinancing Act (P.L. 102–233)	25	25	
Food, Agriculture, Conservation and Trade Act Amendments (P.L. 102–237)	(2)	(2)	
Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (P.L. 102–240)	18,514	(590)	
Coast Guard authorization (P.L. 102–241)	(1)	(1)	
Deposit Insurance Reform and Protection Act (P.L. 102–242)	3	3	
Discretionary estimating adjustment	(233)	(5,823)	
Total appropriation and other spending legislation	663,286	426,586	2,959

PARLIAMENTARIAN STATUS REPORT, 102D CONGRESS, 2D SESSION, HOUSE ON-BUDGET SUPPORTING DETAIL FOR FISCAL YEAR 1992—Continued

[As of close of business Jan. 21, 1992]

	Budget authority	Outlays	Revenues
CONTINUING RESOLUTION AUTHORITY P.L. 102–145			
Foreign Operations (expires March 31, 1992)	14,034	5,496	
Offsetting receipts	(41)	(41)	
Total continuing resolution authority	13,992	5,454	
MANDATORY ADJUSTMENTS			
Entitlement authority and other mandatory adjustments required to conform with current law estimates in budget resolution	(1,208)	950	
ENACTED 2D SESSION			
Total current level	1,274,190	1,204,743	853,364
Total budget resolution	1,269,300	1,201,600	850,400
Amount Remaining:			
Over budget resolution	4,890	3,143	2,964
Under budget resolution			

[1] Less than $500 thousand.

[2] This act increased the current law estimate for veterans compensation by $3 million and is included in the Veterans-HUD appropriations bill.

Note: Numbers may not add due to rounding.

LT. GEN. WILLIAM H. RENO RETIRES AFTER 31 YEARS

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, I want to recognize the service of Gen. William H. Reno, who will retire from the U.S. Army, at the end of January 1992. He currently serves as the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, U.S. Army.

Lieutenant General Reno was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in 1961, and was commissioned a second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers. His career was marked by command and staff assignments of consistently increasing levels of responsibility in the United States and overseas. He served two tours in the Republic of Vietnam. Subsequent assignments included duty with the 5th Infantry Division, the Army's Training and Doctrine Command, and the Department of the Army. In 1988, he began an assignment as the Chief of Program Analysis and Evaluation, impacting favorably on every facet of the total Army for years to come. At such a critical time in our history, General Reno applied the much-needed detailed analysis of programs and initia-

tives to ensure the Army and the Nation was being well served.

In August 1990, General Reno became the Army's chief personnel officer when he was appointed as the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel. What a dynamic time to assume so important a position. Saddam Hussein's forces had just invaded nearby Kuwait. General Reno faced a complex and seemingly contradictory task of simultaneously planning for and executing the largest buildup of forces since World War II and the eventual drawdown of that same Army by more than 25 percent in only 5 years. This buildup also included the largest mobilization of National Guard and Reserves since World War II. Throughout it all, General Reno ensured that Army policy was efficient, practical and reflective of a sincere concern for the well-being of the soldiers and their families.

Thanks in no small part to General Reno, the U.S. Army is the best Army in the world and the very best it has ever been. Throughout his entire career, he took his role as a professional soldier seriously. His measure of achievement has been nothing less than unfailing service to this Nation and his Army. There has been no greater, more trusted steward of the Nation's resources than Gen. Bill Reno. The Army will have difficulty in filling his shoes and but will be richer for his years of devoted service. The Army today is composed of the brightest, best trained; and ready soldiers that we have ever had. He can be proud of their accomplishments and share in the credit. He has been mainstay of the Army leadership for many years. The Nation and the Army will miss him.

THE ECONOMIC CHALLENGE FACING CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, tonight the President will deliver his State of the Union Address to the Congress and to the American people.

This afternoon, I am joined by some of the great leaders in the House to discuss the situation confronting our country on this day of the President's third State of the Union Address.

These last 3 years have been filled with events we deemed unimaginable in our lifetimes. After spending trillions of dollars, after losing over 100,000 precious American lives, the nations of Eastern Europe, and the Republics of the former Soviet Union have finally been liberated and their peoples emancipated.

The sacrifice of three generations of Americans have been validated, and new horizons of open societies and open markets lie before us.

This is our historic moment: Communism is dead, the hammer and sickle has been lowered, the cold war is over, and we won.

Under normal circumstances, these triumphs would occasion celebrations of incredible proportions, and rightly so.

But in the cities I have been visiting, and in the hearts of people I have met along the way, there is consternation not celebration, there is fear and not rejoicing. How could something that went so right be greeted with emotions that feel so wrong?

Our people feel we are living in an era of economic decline. Economic strength is the fundamental measure of a nation's power, both at home and abroad, and other nations are exhibiting greater strength and vitality than we are.

At home, our people are finding it more and more difficult to raise their families, educate their children, walk their streets with security, and save for the future.

Our people play by the rules, but the system isn't working for them. Our people try to take care of themselves, but they cannot afford quality health care.

Our people make high-quality products, but their Government isn't fighting foreign trade barriers.

Our people want equal opportunity, but official policy is dedicated to helping only the rich. Our people would do anything to help their children, but they find diminishing opportunity for the next generation in comparison to the chances they had.

These are the anxieties and apprehensions that the President must address this evening. His speech cannot be a political speech; it cannot simply be a slogan to get him past the next election.

His speech must be a visionary, bold, and comprehensive speech, designed to get America moving into the next century—more prosperous and united than we are today.

If he offers such a speech, I know we are prepared to respond positively and promptly. If he does not, congressional Democrats will stand and fight for what we believe, solutions that make sense for the American people, especially our working families.

If you had to boil it down, what I think we need to hear tonight is a speech about respect, reform, renewal, and reality:

Respect for the middle-class;

Reform for our country as we make the transition from the cold war to the new economic competition; and

Renewal of the contract between government, our people and business, and reality—no more gimmicks, smoke and mirrors, or cooking the books.

Our first challenge is to clear away the wreckage of Reaganomics and to restore respect for the middle class.

The experiment in supply-side economics has been tried, tested, and run its course—and the experiment failed. In the 1980's, hard-pressed, middle-class working families in this country saw their incomes go down, their taxes go up, and their Government benefits cut.

At the same time, the most privileged Americans saw their incomes go up and their taxes go down.

As the middle class got crushed between rising prices and falling incomes, American economic strength suffered.

Respect for the middle class isn't a political slogan, it is an economic policy—we cannot have a strong country if the people who work for a living cannot support their families.

Democrats are looking to the President for a comprehensive strategy to raise the incomes and the aspirations of people who work. That means a significant tax cut for the middle class paid for by increasing taxes on the rich.

That means opening up the doors to college opportunity for moderate-income people.

That means offering a sweeping reform of the health care system, so that costs are cut, health care profiteering stops, and people who lose their jobs keep their health care coverage.

We need a new experiment—in trickle-up or bubble-up economics. We need to say that our economic strength begins with creating new opportunities for middle-class people to improve their living standards.

With the end of the cold war, we must act anew and think anew; we need reform and renewal. Today, our challenges are economic, not military.

When the President went to Tokyo, as he did this month, you could see the outlines of the new world order in fresh relief.

What counts is not the number of men and women under arms, what counts is how many people are working. What matters is not megatons, but megabytes. What matters is not the accuracy of our missiles, but the efficiency of our supercomputers.

This means we need investments in people, and investments in education and research. We need a tough, hard-headed trade policy that fights as hard to reduce barriers to American exports as we fought in the cold war to reduce the number of missiles pointed at the United States.

I would like to see bold, new policies in the area of competitiveness, research and development. I would like to see a massive training and retraining initiative.

I would like to see a recognition on the part of the President that the world has changed.

Finally, we need a strong dose of reality across the board. I hope the press reports are wrong, and the President does not use phony economic numbers in his budget.

For years, the Republicans have claimed that cutting taxes for the rich produces money for the Federal Treasury. The last time I checked, America is running the largest deficits in our history.

If the President's program is predicated upon using tax cuts to make the deficit look smaller, or to ladle on more tax cuts for the rich, he will be making a big mistake.

We need reality in the defense budget. A defense program must be built upon the remaining threats we face. Any extra money must not be used to cut taxes for the rich, it must be used to invest in America's economic strength.

The President's budget should not assume Congress will make further deeper cuts in the Medicare Program to pay for other initiatives. I urge the President tonight to unveil an honest, reality-based economic program.

America needs change. America needs an economic revival. America needs a new, long-term, comprehensive plan to get this country moving forward again.

This year, especially, this year, Band-Aids are not enough. We cannot accept short-term political fixes; we need a long-term program that will restore America's leadership and strength into the next century.

We need more than a Presidential speech—we need Presidential follow-through. We need a dedication on the part of the President to work hard to produce real results for American people.

We hope the President unveils such a program tonight. If he does, he can expect our cooperation. But if his program falls short, if the reality doesn't meet the rhetoric, Democrats in Congress will move—swiftly and intelligently—to put a real program together that meets our needs.

With the end of the cold war, this is America's moment. This should be our time to celebrate. It should also be the time we get to work—building a new, more prosperous country that fulfills the dreams of America's working families as we enter the 21st century.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR].

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri for yielding and commend him for his remarks. I think as we anticipate the speech tonight, it is clear that the American public is viewing this Chamber and this night as a very important night for not only the next 6 months, but for the decade of the 1990's.

As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] stated, I do not think any of us on this side of the aisle intend to be critical, because I think all of us realize the importance at this time in our Nation's history, particularly with the economic problems that we face, that it is critical that we come more than halfway to meet this President in a bipartisan fashion to deal with the issues that face this country.

I must say though that after having waited for 3 years, I think all of us who have looked for some type of strategy on the economy with respect to energy, with respect to jobs, with respect to trade, with respect to competition, that the expectation level of tonight's speech is very high. That is because there has been so much silence by this administration over this 3 years with respect to this very important agenda which now we are faced with having to deal with in such a short time.

Second, as the gentleman from Missouri pointed out, all of us who have had the opportunity to visit our districts, as I have in Oklahoma over the last 2 months, have come to the realization that our people are concerned and scared and fearful of the future.

In visiting with people, whether it be in Claremore, OK, or Musgokee, the message was very clear that they sent to me as an opportunity for me to address the Nation, which is that if we can find money for the Kurds, for the Turks, and for the Soviet Union, we can find money for Oklahomans and people from Missouri and this whole country.

I think tonight's presentation by the President and how we deal with it has to be more than just a speech, because I think the American public is tired of just rhetoric and photo opportunities. I think they expect tomorrow for us to address with substance and with action the issues which concern them.

I look forward to the President's remarks tonight. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] said, I think we enter tonight's speech, as well as tomorrow's actions, with anticipation that together as a nation, Democrats and Republicans, we can work for all people.

As I was traveling around in Oklahoma during the last 2 months it became clear to me also that Oklahomans were concerned about three major issues which the gentleman addressed in his remarks.

The first is they are interested in hearing tonight from the President as to what he has planned for jobs, particularly in the area of training and education. Because as they have watched the massive layoffs that have occurred at General Motors, at IBM, and at the United Technologies, they realize that our country is going through a restructuring and that that restructuring will require education. It will require retraining of our workers so we can anticipate the new competition and the new jobs that will be there. They are looking forward to hearing from the President tonight on what strategy he has for new jobs.

They are also concerned about health care. As the gentleman knows from his own town meetings that he had in St. Louis, as well as the ones I had in northeastern Oklahoma, Americans came out in mass numbers to tell us about the problems they are faced with concerning health care. Whether it is the small businessman who has had to drop his health care insurance for himself and his employees because of the skyrocketing costs, or the elderly couple who cannot afford their medicine, or the young couple that cannot find an OB/GYN to deliver their baby, it is clear Americans want the President to address health care in this country tonight and how we can get a handle on the expansive costs that we have seen.

The gentleman is aware that just last year we spent in this country $739 billion on health care. We estimate unless we reverse the cost increases, that that number could go to $817 billion this year.

Oklahomans, people from Missouri, and Americans in general want to know what this President and this Congress has to do to try to deal with this issue.

Finally, not necessarily in a parochial nature, but I think Oklahomans want to know about energy.

At this time last year we had 500,000 of our best and brightest young men and women situated 5,000 miles away defending a basic resource which we have a tremendous abundance of in our own country.

I think Oklahomans and people in this country want to know how we can ever again avoid sending that kind of manpower that far away to defend this basic resource.

I hope the President will address the Nation tonight and say he does want to complete an energy strategy before the election that will promote the types of things that will ensure that we will have oil and gas drilling in our own country, that we will rely on our own resources here, and we will promote an energy security that this Nation does not have now, and it will ensure a better and brighter future for all of us.

So all of us, as we anticipate in the next couple of hours the President's speech, look at it with great interest.

I want to express my thanks to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT] for taking this hour out to kind of lay the tone for what I think will be the Democratic response to whatever the President presents tonight, and that is one of cooperation. But very simply, we believe it is more than just a speech, it is more than rhetoric. We have a responsibility to back that up, starting tomorrow, in a bipartisan active movement to help the country.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR] for a very fine statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DERRICK].

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

Mr. Speaker, the speech that we are to hear tonight is one of the most significant that I have anticipated and which I will have heard in my 18 years in Congress. At this time last year we were anticipating what would be done

in the Persian Gulf. Hundreds of thousands of our men and women were overseas. It was very important to the future of this country, to the future of the world, and to the future of our supply of fuel.

□ 1540

Tonight's speech, I think, we are not talking about what is going to happen to this country in the next 6 months or the next year or the next 2 years. We want to hear what is going to happen to our economic base way into the next century, into the 21st century.

After the Second World War, our country had everything that was worth having in the world. We had the industrial capacity. We had the gold. We had the Armed Forces. We had the technology. We had the expertise in any field that one wanted to name. And I suppose for about 20 or 25 years we in this country could build what we wanted to and sell it generally for what we wanted to charge for it.

We also had a government that could kind of spend what it wanted to because there were increasing and increasing revenues coming in to the Government. Quite frankly, our Government in many areas became soft and inefficient and, quite frankly, our private sector in many areas, primarily management, as I see it, became soft and uncompetitive.

Here a few years back, 15 years or so, we once again found ourselves, as we had in earlier days, in a very competitive situation. We could no longer afford the luxury of a government that was not efficient, nor can we any longer afford the luxury of a private sector that is not efficient and competitive.

After the Second World War, we made many decisions about the defense of the free world. These decisions were correct and the correctness of those decisions has been borne out in the last 2 or 3 years. But what we neglected to do or our forbearers neglected to do was to say, "When you become able to protect yourselves and protect the free world, we no longer accept that responsibility." And we can no longer accept that responsibility. We can no longer afford to devote 7 or 8 percent of our gross national product to national defense while countries who are taking jobs away from us daily and competing with us throughout the world devote less than 1 percent of their gross national product to their national defense, and we filling in that bill.

One of the things that I would like to hear tonight is not so much how much are we going to cut out of the defense budget but what is it going to take to defend this country and to keep our citizens safe and to remain a leader in the free world, working together with our allies.

The people in this country are not interested, in my opinion, in a tax cut of $1 a day or 60 cents a day or $2 a day, depending on what bracket they are in. They see through that, and it means very little. They see it as a political ploy, as a way to get elected.

The people of this country want to see a plan that is going to guarantee our economic well-being, guarantee our free market process, guarantee jobs for our people throughout the latter part of this decade and into the 21st century. I hope the speech that we hear tonight will give the leadership that this country needs with the opportunity of the Congress to implement that leadership, not on a short term, not on a quick fix.

The primary reason, quite frankly, or one of the primary reasons that we are here today in the economic morass that we find ourselves in is because of the quick fixes and the political expediency of the 1980's.

This is a great nation, the greatest nation in the world. But it was built on the bedrock of a strong economic base. And because of past policies, primarily in the 1980's, not limited to the 1980's but more recently in the 1980's, we find our standard of living, my children's generation are the first generation in the history of this country that do not have a right to expect a higher standard of living than their mothers and their fathers did.

This is un-American. This is not part of what our great country is about.

I would say, as we listen tonight and we stand here in great anticipation of hearing not a quick fix, not something that is going to win the election for either party in this year but a solid bedrock foundation for economic expansion of this country into the 21st century.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for his statement and would simply add that often, in my town hall meetings, people will ask, will not a particular tax cut solve our problem or a particular public works program or a particular education program. I often like to relate this story, because I think it helps people get a sense what it is going to take, of Tom Landry, when he was coach of the Dallas Cowboys and they were winning championship after championship, kind of like the Washington Redskins just did.

The press used to love to ask Tom Landry, did not the Cowboys have a magic playbook. The press thought that he must have some secret plays that the other team did not anticipate, and that is why he was able to score so many points.

And he used to love to answer the question because he would say, "The Dallas Cowboys do not have a secret playbook."

In fact, he said "Everybody knows the four or five plays that we have. We have always run just the plain basic four or five plays we have always had." He said, "That isn't the reason we win. The reason we win," he said, "is because we execute fundamentals better than anybody else."

Whenever I talk or think about economics and job and income and economic strength, I think of that story because I really think in this case football is just like economics. There is no quick fix. There is no one button that we can push. There is no one program that we can pass. There is no one tax cut that we can put in place. There is no one program that we can implement that will get us out of the long-range problem of economic decline that we have been in now for 10 to 15 years.

Income is going down. Generations are feeling like they are not going to do as well as the last, et cetera, et cetera, all the things we know, all the things we hear from our constituents.

What we need to start saying and doing are increasing our ability in the fundamentals of economic growth. We are never going to be as good as everybody in the world on everything, but we have to have improvements in the area of capital formation and savings, research and development, energy, education and training, trade policy, the policy of making our health care system strong and competitive, in all these areas we have to see improvement. And they have to be attacked simultaneously by the President and by the Congress together and by the American people.

If we can mount that kind of an effort, even in the next year, 2 years, we will see tangible results in the years that follow that. And that is what I think the gentleman has talked about, and that is what we hope is said tonight, and that is what we want to work on in the days ahead.

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

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT], the majority leader, again for taking time to focus on where we are as a nation. And while my football knowledge is not as great as the majority leader's, I think the point that he makes, there is no silver bullet, oftentimes the campaign or the debate that leads to the campaign has its miraculous, simplistic solution that is going to revive the economy and put us back in the place of prominence that we were economically.

□ 1550

It is a process of dealing with very basic, fundamental aspects of our economy, and it seems to me that as a nation what we tried to do over the last decade is miracle formulas that would work overnight, supply side economics, programs that were going to miraculously balance the budget, enrich the

Nation, and do it all without any pain or effort. As somebody who keeps trying to lose weight, in the same sense, it does not work without pain or effort.

We have spent the last 50 years paying for the defense of Western Europe and Japan. The argument was, for much of that time, that we cannot let the Germans and the Japanese take the lead in this, even though they have the most robust economies, because, after all, they were the enemy in World War II. Their aggression is what started World War II, so it would be improper to ask them to take the main line confrontation efforts against the Soviet Union, so we spent the money. Now we are spending about $150 billion a year. Last week the President, within 2 days, said do not look in his budget for lots of programs to start things in this economy. The following day he said that he has $645 million to help the Soviet Union out, help Russia out and the republics that have now replaced the Soviet Union.

Frankly, I am not against that. What I am against is maintaining 140 billion dollars' worth of manpower, weapons, and bases to defeat the Soviet Union militarily, to have the American taxpayers carry that burden, and at the same time carry the burden of feeding them. We have to make up our minds, do we want to defeat them and invade them, or prevent the potential invasion from them, or are we going to help revive them to be democratic governments who can sustain themselves. We cannot afford to do both.

Second, the account book does not start today. We have paid the bill for 50 years. For 50 years American taxpayers spent more money in Western Europe and Japan than we did in Bangladesh on the hungry or in Ethiopia or anyplace that there was a disaster around the world. We spent more money on these wealthy nations and their defense because we believed in their democratic forms of government, and we thought that was important to the world.

It is now their turn to play a greater role in that. So we have got to get relieved of some of that burden. I have argued for some time the President ought to either get half the money from the Europeans and the Japanese and use that to revive our economy, or we ought to bring those troops home. Just simply bringing the troops home will increase activity economically in this country. One economist said it could replace as much as 40 percent of what has been lost in the economy.

Then we have to look at some of the things that the majority leader has led the fight on here for so long, protecting our domestic industries. You know, we have had this great debate in the early eighties. Every time we came up with a bill to give us a fair shot at survival, "Oh, no, you guys are protectionists." I was, I guess, heartened to some degree, but it was too late and there was not enough of it. The President finally went to Japan and said, "Gee, it is not exactly a level playing field."

As they had done so many times in the past, they made some agreements there that they later said did not actually exist. They have done that on chips, they have done that on autos before. We are doing the same thing to the automotive industry and the automotive parts industry that happened to the electronics industry.

I know the majority leader knows some of those numbers better than I do, but apparently the Japanese are losing money in a lot of their domestic automobile sales and their European sales, but they have this protective market in Japan where they can make the profits and that will lead to the end of the American automobile industry.

I would like to hear from him about some of those facts. What we have to do here is more than cut defense spending. If we cut defense spending in the midst of this depression or recession, and the President finally agrees it is a recession, and it is the longest recession, longer than the Great Depression. In my State it is a depression. The insurance industry is on its back, the banking industry is dead, the real estate industry is dead, and now they are talking about shutting down what is left of our manufacturing in defense without even a replacement.

It seems to me that the administration is saying to those people who won the cold war for us, those that invested their efforts and talents to build this great Nation, that "You are disposable. We do not need you anymore."

The President supported a $500 billion conversion bill last year. The administration today is still sitting on $50 million of the $200 million that the majority leader led the effort on for conversion in the United States and diversification of American industry.

How can we not take a look at helping our industries revive themselves in this time?

It just seems to me that what this administration seems to be saying is what the Ford administration said to New York City: "It is just tough. It is too bad. It is your problem."

Mr. GEPHARDT. The gentleman, I think, has raised one of the critical points here, and that is if we are to have economic success in the kind of world we are in today, it is going to take not only executing the fundamentals of economic success and growth better than we have, it is probably also going to take a set of policies between the private and the public sector, the Government and our private companies, that will allow us to both go through this transition from a cold war economy to a hot economic war economy, and at the same time give our vital strategic industries the chance to be able to compete in the realistic world in which they exist.

Let me go back to the issue of trade, and let us talk for a moment about automobiles. General Motors announced at the end of the year 75,000 people will get the pink slip in the next 2 years; 21 plants will be closed. There is a good reason for it. GM has lost 10 percent of the American market in the last few years. It is real simple. In the last 12 months 50 percent of the cars sold at retail in the United States were foreign cars. Only Ford has had their market share go up by three points. Chrysler's share is down as well.

We can say all we want about the quality of American cars, the efforts of our workers, the efforts of our managers. I am the first to admit that there are times in the past when our products were not as good as they should be.

I think it is important to note that quality has gone way up. Measures have been taken by both workers and managers. We are much more competitive today. That is why to my constituents I have been saying, "Try American; maybe not buy American, that is up to you, but try American. Give it another look."

But in the midst of all of this, we have people saying "You cannot get tough on trade. You cannot try to get a level playing field. It is all our fault. Blame America first. Look for all the problems here."

I am willing to look for our share of problems, but is it not time that we had what some would call an industrial policy to see that we can have success in automobiles? And to people who say "Let us not do any of that, the Government cannot cooperate with the private sector," I simply say "I have a question: Do you think we can give up the automobile industry? If you do, we do not have anything to talk about. If you do not, then let us talk about what it is going to take to save it. If my ideas are not good or your ideas, what are somebody else's ideas? Tell us something. Let us have a debate. Let us have a discussion of how we are going to do this. Is it trade policy?"

I am told that when we take cars to Japan, just for a for instance, they add about 13,000 dollars' worth of costs that we do not put on their cars coming here. Maybe we have not moved the wheels to the right. Maybe our quality is not what it should be. But it is darned hard to talk an auto executive or an autoworker into doing all of that investment to try to sell something that is going to cost $13,000 more in that market than their products coming here. So these are the policies that need to be examined.

Mr. GEJDENSON. I think we ought to take a minute for the American people to understand that what happens here is each car has to be individually inspected and alloy samples taken from the rims. If we started doing that to Japanese cars coming here we could

not have enough. We might have full employment just from the inspectors watching them. If we slowed theirs down, if we raised the price of theirs, they would not be competitive in this country.

The place to look in the mirror is why have our trade policies not given our workers a level playing field. There is imperfection here. There is no imperfection, though, in the other country.

So many of these policies are tied together. We have not had an energy policy for a dozen years. I saw a gentleman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. SYNAR] talking about that for a moment. We spent tens of billions of dollars and American lives at risk to free Kuwait, partly because of its energy richness, and the Western world's dependence on that energy.

□ 1600

If we spent 10 percent of that on energy independence and energy research and development, we would reduce the trade deficit. We would make the country stronger and richer, high-speed rail giving people an option besides airplanes and cars.

We are going to spend $30 billion, and I hope the administration will cut some of that tomorrow, but the plan now is about $28 billion for the operation and maintenance of facilities in Europe. We ought to bring those dollars home, help the State and local governments who are in absolute economic desperate straits from Connecticut to California, and the problem with the States is that they have to raise taxes. They cannot run a deficit. They lay people off, thereby accelerating the recession, the depression that we are in. Help them out.

Take the other money and spend it on renewable energy, on energy conservation, on expanding our national parks, on a high-speed rail system on each of the coasts, and maybe out to Chicago, to do economic development work.

Again, the President says he has got $645 million to feed Russia. I am for helping those people, but for God's sakes, the same administration sits on $50 million for the Economic Development Administration to give my workers a chance.

Rumors are tomorrow he shuts down the sub program, and all of these other programs. From a national security standpoint there can be debate. There is no question about that. But from an economic standpoint and from economic justice, it is wrong to leave these communities and these individuals languishing.

We need the kind of program that will start this country again, and it is not going to be done through some halfhearted effort.

The difference between this and other recessions is that our financial institutions have been devastated by the 1986 tax act, by all of those things along the way that took value from real estate and banking, and the fact is that we are now a debtor nation rather than a creditor nation. We have spent time on this floor speaking about that.

I would hope for our part here that the majority leader and the Speaker would lead an effort to engage the administration, and I am hopeful that the President has adopted the agenda that we have spoken about on this floor so often. I sense that the President recognizes that what he has done to date has been inadequate, and I hope that he comes here with more than just, you know, a halfhearted kind of sampling of showing some compassion and putting people to work.

We need a high-presence program to give America confidence and to put American workers back to work. I would hope that the majority leader and the Speaker would do what they have always done and try to get our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to join us to put Americans to work. Let us take some of that money we have been spending, and we have been spending $140 billion a year in Europe, and let us take some of that money and build a high-speed rail system on the east coast and west coast to give the defense workers new places to use their skills and talents. Let us take a look at building the kind of subway cars that they talked about in California for the rest of the cities in this country so that they can buy them made here, whether it is a Sikorsky in my State or the helicopter folks in other States, with the electronics and the sheet-metal capabilities to give our workers a chance to bid on those projects. And let us not see any more instances where Americans are the low bidder and somebody else is chosen for that contract.

The Europeans in EC 1992 have said that if you want to sell to a European public organization, to a government, to a state, to a nation, to a local government, you have got to have a European presence. We have got to do some of that to revive our economy. We have got to give Americans a job. We have got to give Americans some hope for the future, and then we need to make sure that we invest in education and health care so that we are the kind of competitive nation that can take on our economic adversaries as well as we have taken on our military adversaries.

I would again commend the majority leader for bringing us together.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement. Obviously he has made the point that there are fundamentals of economic growth and success. They have to be addressed together, not singly, not alone, and there is no magic button, no silver bullet. We have to do it all at the same time. It is a piece of one cloth. That is the kind of bold, comprehensive, long-term set of ideas that we hope are there tonight and that we want to work on.

I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I yield to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I think what the gentleman from Connecticut has just spoken about points out the symptoms of what the majority leader has actually been talking about for quite a long time.

Unfortunately, and I say that in the most positive sense of the word, unfortunately, this administration and the last one have had no vision for the average little Joe, the average man, the average woman, the average family in this country. They have pursued policies which, in their vision, were going to enrich the country, but, in effect, have only enriched a very small few of Americans, leaving the vast majority of Americans out in the cold. They have pursued these policies diligently through 12 years now, 12 years of the Reagan-Bush administration. All we have gotten at the end of 12 years is the rich who have gotten richer by every calculation of every economist in this country, and the poor who have gotten poorer by every calculation of those same economists, and the middle class who have been rent apart and whose assets and earning power have been reduced, paying the burden for that very widening of the assets gap to the wealthy. That is what has happened. Nobody can deny it anymore. It is out there.

The President, unfortunately, chose for the first 10 months of last year to even avoid talking about the recession that existed, because it did not square with the predictions, the rosy scenarios that were painted all during these years. The 1980's, why, they were magnificent. You can chart and calculate the growth in so many areas in this country.

The problem was, as the gentleman well knows, it did not trickle down. What trickled down was the beginning of the end of the infrastructure of this country, shipping jobs overseas, changing the way that America gathers its wealth and produces its GNP, by switching jobs from the high-pay manufacturing, highly technologically advanced, to the service industry, to the menial, to the lower pay. We lost the chip industry. We lost the electronics industry. We have lost the car industry to a large degree.

The majority leader well knows there is now one, only one, steel plant left in this country that makes beams, girders, for high-rise buildings, one plant left in the whole United States that makes the structural beams that are

the framework and backbone and support of the high-rise buildings in this country where we build more high rises than any other country in the world, or used to.

These are intolerable things, and there has been no vision of how to change it.

The gentleman from Connecticut talked about an energy policy. What about every policy? The infrastructure has been allowed to deteriorate. If it was not for the Congress and, frankly, Democratic-led initiatives, although a lot of Republicans to their credit joined in because they saw the dangers, we would not have been able to pass some of the bills that we passed to keep this country glued together: Highway bills, road bills, spending money on the infrastructure which, according to the Reagan people, is a dirty word. If you spent money domestically, somehow you were cheating the military, but that is all past.

There is still no vision. We have yet to hear, and if I am wrong, I would certainly ask the majority leader to correct me. We have yet to hear enunciated a vision for this country. The President goes off to the Far East hat in hand, not wanting to beg, but appearing that way, but, "Let us sell some more cars."

Mr. Speaker, I do not want their largesse. I do not want charity from Japan. I want fairness. I do not want a guarantee that we can sell one car in Japan, but they ought to have the guts to open their markets so that we can make an attempt to sell cars to the average Japanese. Do not keep us out. That is what the Japanese Government does.

The vision on trade has been as lacking as the vision everywhere else, and the end product of all of this has been that Americans have suffered.

Oh, wealthy Americans did well in the 1980's, but in the 1990's, the poor Americans and the middle-class Americans are now paying the price.

□ 1610

Educational facilities closed to many Americans because they cannot afford to get in. Jobs lost by many Americans because their industries moved overseas or offshore because the economy is in recession, bad recession.

Health care, for many Americans nonexistent, for many Americans they are uninsured, scared to death that their kids or their wives or their mothers or fathers are going to have an illness that robs them of every asset, every dime they have been able to put away and save.

There is a pervasive uncertainty about the future of this country among Americans today. We have got to change that perception, and it is going to take the President to help the Congress or the Congress to help the President, whichever way you want to do it. I am just afraid that tonight we are not going to hear a vision for the rest of the decade in this country, that the majority leader and I tomorrow are going to have to get up hopefully with the Democrats and the Republicans and make it work here, because all we are going to get is warmed over Reaganomics, warmed over trickle-down theories. Give them a capital gains tax cut. Whatever business wants, give it to them. He has already unveiled some of that. He has talked about the capital gains cut and about changing the rules and regulations so that business can do business. That is what we heard in 1981. Cut the taxes on the rich. They will deliver the jobs. Take away the regulations from business. They will deliver the jobs.

Well, the majority leader knows what happened in the eighties. All we did was run the money around the upper circles of this country so that one rich person could buy some other rich person's business, adding debt each time they went around that circle. And in the end, who is paying the bill? The workers in those businesses.

Macy's, one of the oldest, biggest names in retailing, just filed for bankruptcy, and who knows what will happen with so many others.

GM, 75,000 laying off.

IBM, 20,000 laying off.

Texas Instruments, 6,000 laying off.

It is a terribly sad time in this country. Voltaire once said, "Where there is no vision, the people perish."

Well, the American people are vibrant and strong individually, but their opportunities are perishing and the future for their children does not look that bright. We need that vision. We need a policy for this country to go into the 21st century, and it has not been forthcoming.

I pray that tonight the President stands up, eschews politics, sets aside the short-term gain that he needs politically because his numbers in the polls are sinking like a rock, and stands up and enunciates a vision, a real vision, and talks about building up this country once again.

I know the majority leader has been doing that for many years. I hope the President is going to join the majority leader in doing that tonight, because if he does not, the country and its future are going to be even less assured than they are right now, and I think Americans want a leader in the White House for America.

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

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. VISCLOSKY].

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

There has been a lot of discussion during this special order about fundamentals, about having a vision for America. Also, the gentleman from South Carolina in his remarks talked about persistence and followthrough, and most recently the gentleman from Florida talked about steel.

I would like to emphasize steel in the concept of persistence in terms of followthrough after this evening's remarks.

I am not so concerned about what the President says this evening. I am sure it will make most of us feel good in terms of what the verbiage will be all about. In a sense, it takes me back to November 4, 1988, when then-candidate and Vice President George Bush wrote to the late Senator John Heinz and said:

> I support the domestic steel industry. I support an extension of the VRA's and I support activities and negotiations to eliminate unfair trading practices in steel.

When those words were spoken and written several days after the last Presidential election, I think most people in the steel community believed that what the President was really talking about was the 5-year extension that was then pending in the U.S. Congress and supported by the industry and by steel workers across this land.

What turned out to happen after the election took place is that the President only supported a 2½-year extension of the VRA program. To give the President his due in terms of trying to negotiate an end to unfair steel practices, but here we are 63 days before the lapse of the 2½-year extension of VRA's and no end in sight in terms of those negotiations and certainly a world as we see it toward the end of this year or next year where unfair trade practices will persist in terms of steel.

After then-candidate George Bush makes his commitment to the steel industry, what happened during the next 3 years? Well, 22,900 steel workers lost their jobs, and this month we saw 690 more steel workers at the USX South Chicago steel plant lose their jobs. This month, Inland Steel, which has their sole production facility in my congressional district, indicated they are going to terminate jobs for a quarter of their work force, or another 3,500 jobs after the fundamental commitment of then-candidate George Bush who helped the domestic steel industry.

I am sure that the President will come before us again tonight and express his caring in terms of the plight that many Americans feel and that American industry feels in terms of the needs that present themselves to society. I hope the approach is fundamental, but my grave concern is what happens next month and what happens in March, in April, in May and in June.

They will hear that he cares, but I think what my unemployed steel workers will hear is what the President told David Frost in an interview on January

3, and that is, "I will do anything to get elected."

So I agree with the majority leader that we ought to listen and hear the President out. I hope that he does exhibit that vision for America and talks about the fundamentals.

I would hope that he talks about steel, but my grave concern is that the American people and that we in this Chamber keep our eye on the ball and make sure that there is followthrough by the administration, but my concern is that the statements of 1988 will simply see themselves repeated in the 1992 elections.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement.

I would reinforce what the gentleman says about the steel industry and again say the answer in the steel industry is, yes, trade measures like the voluntary restraints which have allowed us through what I call a quasi-industrial policy to save our industry against predatory competition severe price cutting and dumping by other countries that almost drove us out of the steel business entirely, but also a whole range of fundamental economic measures that we need to undertake to make sure we have a strong steel industry.

As the gentleman well knows, the greatest user of steel in the United States is the automobile industry. If the automobile industry is in a depression as it is today and plants are being closed and jobs are being lost, capacity is being down sized, there can be no result but a severe negative impact on the domestic steel industry.

So there are intertwining relationships between industries. We need a program that buttresses and reinforces and strengthens all of our vital and strategic industries so that they can work together, that they can feed on one another and reinforce one another, that the synergies that exist in our economy can continue to exist and be strengthened of themselves.

We need education and training. We need savings and investment. We need a sensible fiscal policy, research and development for the latest technology, health care proposals so we can be competitive with other countries and contain the costs of health care as they have done with their universal coverage and cost containment measures, and other things as well.

The bottom line is that what we need tonight and in the days ahead, a speech and then follow-through on putting together the fundamental elements of economic growth and success in this society. If the President will do it, we will cooperate. If it is a short-term fix and it does not fill the bill, we will try to exert leadership as we have in the past here in the Congress. We will reach out to Members on the other side. We will ask for cooperation, but most important, we are bound and determined here to see that this economy of America, which is the bedrock of our strength, goes forward in a positive manner. That is what we are committed to and that is what we will be focusing on hopefully with the President and with the people and our good colleagues on the other side in the days ahead.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his fine statement.

□ 1620

AFTER THE PRESIDENT'S STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS, THEN WHAT WILL HAPPEN?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DERRICK). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I listened with considerable interest to my colleagues on the Democratic side talk about the upcoming State of the Union this evening and how they were going to react to it, including one or two of them who had sort of prejudged it sight unseen. And I could not help but wonder what the American people, watching and listening and trying to understand this Congress and this city, must make of all of us.

Let me suggest that we are at a very interesting turning point: This evening at 9 o'clock the President of the United States will make a report to the country on the state of the Union, something which is required by the Constitution and which originally was done in writing.

George Washington came up and spoke once, he decided he did not like the way Congress dealt with him—we were meeting in New York at that time, over 200 years ago—and he never came back. From then until Woodrow Wilson, Presidents tended to send their messages to Congress in writing, and they were read by a clerk.

Beginning with Woodrow Wilson, we went to the modern speech, and then of course in modern times of television, the speech has been a major spectacle, with coverage on all the networks and probably the largest single viewership other than inauguration.

And I think it is important to put it in context. This is not the acceptance speech at the Republican convention; this is not a campaign speech by the nominee of the party, this is a report on the state of the Union by the President of the United States.

Now, only one person serves as President at a time, only one person has won the election to be President, and under our system that President bears a tremendous responsibility.

I believe when President Bush comes here tonight, he is going to outline a fairly broad, sweeping program. He is going to move us toward what I regard as a necessary revolution to replace the welfare state.

He is going to suggest in education, in health, in housing, in the economy, in a variety of areas, very substantial changes. And I think it is fascinating and I wish I had had a chance to have a dialogue with our friends on the Democratic leadership because the question for the last 3 months has been, "Does President Bush have a program?"

Now, based on the briefings I have been through, I am confident that, at the end of the State of the Union tonight, that question will be answered; the President will have outlined a program. He will have shown where we need to go to get out of the recession, he will have shown where we need to go to change education dramatically so that our children can compete with Germany and Japan.

He will have shown us major changes in health to move toward a better system, accessible to everyone.

I believe by 10 o'clock tonight we will know that President Bush has a program. Then a new question will emerge. After 3 months of our good friends on the Democratic Party relaxing and throwing pot shots at the President, saying, "Well, When is he going to act? When is he going to act? What is he going to be for?", will be over.

Now, as of 10 o'clock tonight the question will be, "What are the Democrats who control Congress going to do about the President's program? Are they going to put the country first? And help pass a program? Help get the economy out of recession? Help create jobs? Move rapidly?"

Or, are they in fact going to listen to their campaign strategists and try to insure that we stay in recession as long as possible so the Democratic candidates have a better chance this fall?

I think what we should look for is not some kind of dumb, simpleminded confrontation. The Democrats are not going to run out and say, "Oh, well, let's not pass anything." They are going to say something very different.

They are going to say, "You know we would like to do it soon, but we have to think about it. We have to study it. We have to amend it."

Or, "Maybe we can't quite pass it in the form it is to be signed, maybe we will have to make sure it gets vetoed."

It will be kind of like quicksand, "Just won't quite get passed, won't quite get to the floor, won't quite ever become law."

Gee, if we are sitting around here in July or August and lots of people are unemployed and the economy still has not recovered, then the Democrats may go to their convention in New York City and they will blame—who? They will blame George Bush. They will say the President "hasn't done anything."

But I do not think the country is that foolish, I do not think the country

is that unsophisticated. I think the country, partly, frankly, because of C-SPAN, has a tremendous capacity to watch this building, and the country is very good at going to bottom lines.

Please do not tell me what subcommittee it is in, do not tell me that you have held 37 hours of hearings, do not tell me you are going to get around to it someday. Have you passed a signable program?

Now, I hope the President is going to give a very short time limit for passing a program to get out of the recession, to create jobs and to put Americans back to work. I hope he is going to give a 30-day, 45-day at the most, deadline.

First of all the Senate Finance Committee and the House Committee on Ways and Means have had hearings. I testified at one myself in December, and I know the majority leader did.

So we have had hours of hearings, we have had witnesses, we have had a time for talking about what to do.

Tonight the President is going to propose something. I would think that by next week the Committee on Ways Means could be in a markup; we could pass a bill possibly by the end of next week, certainly by the beginning of the following week. I would think that the Senate could then take it up. I would hope that we would in fact be in a position to pass a final bill to be sent to the President to be signed by him to create jobs, to increase the speed and the recovery of the American economy, certainly by the end of February, so that Americans could go back to work.

I think it is important to understand where we are at in that sense, because we are going to pass an unemployment extension, and I support that. We are going to continue to help people who do not have a job. But if we give them 13 more weeks, does that not mean that Congress had better act in that timeframe to insure that when their unemployment once again runs out, that we are in a position that they actually can get a job rather than come back and say, "Now let's extend it again"?

You may think I am making something up. But let me suggest this: I initially introduced, along with Senator PHIL GRAMM, the Economic Growth Act in July of last year. The very first time that an unemployment bill came up on the House floor, I tried to amend that unemployment bill, to add to it an Economic Growth Act to create jobs. We had estimates from private economists that our bill would have created somewhere between 1 million and 2 million new jobs.

We said at that time, in August, before the recess, we said if all you do is extend unemployment and you do not pass the kind of tax cuts that are necessary to create jobs, we are going to be right back here ending up in a situation where we have to extend unemployment again.

That it not what people want. Most people I have talked to who are unemployed, they may need a Government check to keep their house, they may need a Government check to feed their family, but what they want is a job.

What they want is an opportunity to work. They want to get off unemployment by getting a job in a recovery so that the economy is growing again.

Five times between July and November we tried to bring to the floor an economic growth bill to create jobs. Five times the Democratic leadership blocked us.

We went to the Committee on Rules, we tried to amend the rule. We tried to offer a motion to recommit. We did all of the parliamentary maneuvers which were possible for the minority party to try to bring to the floor a jobs bill.

The last time was the last weekend we were in session. The entire House Republican Party strongly supported a jobs bill. We were blocked by the Democrats.

Now, the question, starting tonight, is going to be very simple: The President of the United States, in response to the recession, is going to propose a series of steps that will create jobs, that will put people back to work, that will speed up the economy, and he is going to propose that the Congress move quickly.

Now, my guess is, on the other side of the aisle there is a grave danger their first act is going to be to leave; after all, there is a February break coming up. We will have been here for 2 weeks, "cannot stay around too long, might get exhausted, let us go home."

I would say at least for this particular Member I would oppose having a recess in February unless we have a commitment to pass a Jobs and Economic Growth Act before the end of the month.

I would not want to leave here at the beginning of February, having only been in session a few days, if we do not have an absolute public commitment in both the House and the Senate by the Democratic leadership to pass a jobs bill.

But let us look at what is apparently on the schedule. From what I have seen so far, there is no current proposal to bring up a jobs bill for markup next week in the Committee on Ways and Means or to bring it to the floor.

Instead, the major item we have heard so far from the Democratic leadership for next week is a special committee to investigate the so-called October surprise question, but to investigate it only in the narrowest and most partisan way.

□ 1630

Let me explain briefly. At the time when the House ought to be focused on creating jobs, at a time when the House ought to be focused on cutting spending, apparently the Democratic leadership will come to the House next week to suggest spending between 1 and 2 million additional dollars to set up a select committee to investigate the question of whether or not Jimmy Carter lost the election in 1980 because of some deal with Iran by Ronald Reagan.

Now forget the fact that every public figure who has ever been involved has said flatly that it is not true, that it is all phony; forget the fact that we are talking about 11 years ago in an election which I thought President Carter lost in large part because we had 23-percent interest rates, 13-percent inflation, and an economy that was disintegrating. Forget all that.

This particular committee has two peculiar aspects. First, it has been narrowly drawn, only to look at the Reagan campaign and not to look at the Carter administration, even though every outside expert has said, "You cannot understand the dynamics of 1980 without looking at the diplomacy of the Carter administration." Well, the Democrats are literally going to spend $2 million, sort of a gift by the taxpayers against their wishes, give that to the Democratic National Committee to investigate only the Reagan campaign and specifically exclude the Carter administration.

Second, this money is apparently coming from some kind of contingency fund which the Speaker apparently controls, which is large enough, spending a million to 2 million out of it, and yet to the best of my knowledge it has never been audited. No one on my side of the aisle seems to know how much money is in it, and it is apparently just a political fund sitting there to be used to pay for things.

Now I would suggest, if we have $2, $5, $10, $15, $20 million stashed away somewhere in the Capitol, that it would be better off to give that back to the Treasury as a part of reducing the deficit. But I think it tells us something about the mindset of the Democratic leadership.

The very first week after the State of the Union, all we have heard so far is not an effort to create jobs and get out of the recession, but rather it is an effort to be very narrowly partisan and to spend $1 to $2 million of the taxpayers' money on what most people would regard as wasteful Government spending.

Let me go one step further. I believe that we have to recognize in terms of foreign trade, which is a topic my friends in the Democratic Party were talking about a while ago, that there are two truths: First, Japan's door is too closed, and we should kick it in; and, second, some United States companies simply do not compete very hard, and they have got to be a lot better at competing. Both are true.

I would suggest that the President's proposals tonight will almost certainly

include some tax cuts which will increase the ability of American business to buy new equipment, to be more competitive, to be better at being in the world market, to export more, and to create more American jobs selling to foreigners, and what I would suggest is that, if our friends from the Democratic Party truly want to be more competitive in the world market, that they will have a chance tonight to do in fact precisely that by helping pass the President's program to give our manufacturers a chance to move towards more modern equipment, newer factories, and a better ability to compete.

But that requires passing the bill. It requires bringing to the floor something which the President would sign.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, this is a fresh start to the second session of this Congress, and I think the gentleman from Georgia is in the well setting up Congress again for failure. The suggestion somehow is always: Blame Congress first.

I hope, and I think the gentleman would hope, that this would be a new year and a new approach. I think the American people are sick of all the fighting. They want us to join hands and confront the very serious problems facing this country. I do not want the Congress to fail, and I do not want the President to fail. I would like to see us have a fresh start and do some things together, but the gentleman's comments presuppose that Congress is at fault, and Congress will be at fault, and Congress will fail.

It is interesting that I hear the gentleman discussing this economic problem as one problem. I view it as two problems, not necessarily unrelated, but nonetheless two problems.

The first is a business cycle that is in contraction rather than expansion, and the question is: How can we jumpstart it? That is the lexicon that is used. How can we jumpstart the economy to promote growth in the short term?

But the issue is not between now and the next election. We are going to see expansion. The business cycle is a contraction and expansion cycle. The question is not the next election. The question is the next decade for this country. When will we and what will we do to develop policies to put this country on track for the next decade to be able to compete successfully?

I respect the notion that we need to do something. And I hope that most of us will extend our hand of cooperation to join the President to try to create jobs in the short term. But I think by far the more important question facing this country and its future is: What will we do as Americans to put ourselves back on track to be able to compete in the next decade and the next two decades with shrewd, tough, smart international competitors?

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH] has not discussed that tonight. He is talking mostly about what we will do in the next 30 days.

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, I have given a series of speeches in what I call the necessary revolution, replacing the welfare state in order to be competitive. I will be glad to talk about long-term change. I was simply making the point that one of the building blocks to long-term change is going to be to pass an economic growth program.

The gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] is on the Committee on Ways and Means. I believe they passed out today the unemployment proposal.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GINGRICH. It was done in 1 day. We were able to get together on a bipartisan basis. I am supportive of that, as is the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL]. I think it is called the Rostenkowski-Michel bill.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GINGRICH. So, it is bipartisan.

I am simply suggesting that on our side all we have heard for next week is, and I am not trying to be negative, I am just reporting. All I have heard for next week is an extraordinarily partisan decision on scheduling to bring in a very one-sided investigatory committee, and then, second, I have heard no report yet, no signs, no signals, that the Committee on Ways and means will be called into markup. I have heard no reports yet that Senator MITCHELL is going to agree to bring up anything in the other body, and all I am saying is, given the track record of the last 3 years, it is time to suggest, and I hope Congress does not fail. I would love nothing better than to have the Speaker call the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] and say, "Hey, let's have a scheduling conference. Let's get it out in the open, and let's set a commitment that we will pass a bill by March 1," and my colleagues will hear me come to the floor, and I will praise the Democratic leadership for that commitment, and I will be delighted to be able to get a bill through the Congress and to the President.

But the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN] and I both know, and he is much more of an expert on taxes than I am because he serves on the Joint Committee on Taxation, but there is not going to be anything new offered tonight which will require 60 hours of hearings.

I mean we all know all the basic provisions, and we know where his party stands, and we know where my party stands, and we will find out where the country stands, and we could easily mark up next week, and come to the floor the week after, and, if we had a fair rule, and either have a bipartisan bill, which is unlikely, but possible, or have a bill offered by the liberals, and have a bill offered by the conservative coalition, and see who wins. But get it out in the open, and then send the bill to the other body, have some kind of time limit agreed to in the Senate, and get it back here by the last week of February, and by March 1 have something passed.

Now my guess is that confidence in the consumer—the Michigan survey that is so famous—that confidence would skyrocket, that the business community would begin to make investments if they got that kind of public commitment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. DORGAN].

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, my sense is that the fear deep in the gut of most Americans is that this country is seriously off track. I am not talking about for February and March. I am talking about in the long term.

Mr. GINGRICH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. And that Washington is full of a bunch of windbags that by and large do not want to do much about it. They live in the White House and in Congress, but the people do not have confidence that the fundamental problems are problems we are going to confront.

We talk about trade. As the gentleman knows, it is true that our friend, George Will, wrote a piece in the Washington Post called Xenophobes, the Protectionists, the Blaming-Japan-First Crowd. Well, there is just as big a crowd around here that is the blame-America-first crowd. How can we compete in markets that we cannot reach? How can we sell a product in a market that is closed to us?

So, there are a whole series of things we have got to do to put the country back on track.

Mr. GINGRICH. Sure.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Yes, we have got to build the best products in the world. But, if we cannot get them into other markets will not be able to sell them or compete.

Mr. GINGRICH. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. So, we have got to do a whole range of those kinds of things in order to put the country back on track. We have got a crushing, crippling Federal debt that is mortgaging the future of everybody in this country, and the American people, I think, deep down inside believe that is the kind of problem that will prevent this country from realizing its potential.

□ 1640

The question for the President and for this Congress is this: When will you look it in the eye and do something about it? When we decide to do that and exhibit all the pain and agony of doing it, then I think you will see confidence in this country soar.

Mr. GINGRICH. Let me take that example. My guess is—and maybe we can actually work out something that is bipartisan here—my guess is that on our side of the aisle there will be a tremendous willingness to take the cuts in defense which are coming, and I believe that tonight the President is going to announce much larger in cuts in defense spending than we would have expected 2 months ago, and on our side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, you would find tremendous willingness to agree that those cuts should either be applied to the deficit or should go back to the American people as tax cuts. And I think you could even work out a compromise on our side where we could get a bipartisan agreement to apply them only to the deficit.

But I can report to you from the newspaper reports that a number of Democrats have already stepped up and said, "No, no, we can't lower the deficit when we cut defense. We have got to shift it to the welfare side, we have got to spend more money through government."

I would be delighted to have a bipartisan coalition pledging that when we cut defense, it will not go to the welfare state. But do you think, realistically, the Democrats would tolerate that?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Realistically we are a lot better off, instead of speaking to an empty room, to try to figure out how we can develop a bipartisan coalition to reduce the deficit and do what is necessary to improve the country. But I happen to have my own strong feelings about how we reduce defense spending and use that money. I think a major part of it ought to go to deficit reduction because I think the deficit is the crippling impediment that limits all of our futures. Unless and until we look that squarely in the eye, the American people are not going to have any confidence that this country can realize its potential.

The reason I stood up is that I think that Members have gone back home to their districts, Republicans and Democrats, and they have heard sobering views of how people see this town, the President, and the Congress, and realize the people want something different. They do not want business as usual any more; they want this Congress to take some bold action to deal with fiscal policy and with this country's problems.

Mr. GINGRICH. I agree.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. And until and unless we demonstrate we are going to do that, they are not going to have confidence in the future.

Mr. GINGRICH. But does that not inevitably mean that we have to cut wasteful Government spending?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Yes, absolutely. But again let me state the reason I stood up. You and I, Mr. GINGRICH, have had this discussion off and on for a decade. As I listen to you, it is business as usual, and it is this: "You Democrats, you're the big problem. I anticipate you're going to be the problem in the future and you certainly have been in the past. That is my message."

My point is that that is not the way we are going to solve any problems, because you need Democrats and we need Republicans to put this country back on track.

Mr. GINGRICH. What would you say if you were a Republican and five times last year you tried to bring an economic growth bill to the floor and five times the Democratic leadership stopped you? Is it not fair to say, "Wait a second, guys"?

What would you do if you were a Republican and you wanted to schedule a markup in the Ways and Means Committee next week on the President's proposals, and you know the Democratic leadership does not want to do it?

All I am saying is that the Democrats who have controlled the House since 1954, have an obligation either to work with us and be bipartisan or to be prepared to have us come out here and suggest they are not doing their job. I would much rather be bipartisan, but I have not seen a single step of that kind, other than the unemployment bill today, which I think is a good sign, and I am supportive of it. I have encouraged Congressman MICHEL to cosponsor it. I said, "I will help to get it through the Congress as fast as possible." I am eager to see us pass that on a bipartisan basis.

And if your leadership wanted to come over and say, "Let's have a bipartisan effort to cut spending," I would be willing to do it. If they came over and said, "Let's have a bipartisan schedule to pass an economic growth act," I would be willing to do it.

My only reason for citing the Democratic leadership is that my experience in the first session of this Congress was that they were very partisan in their scheduling, that they refused to pass an economic growth program, and that they were not willing to allow us to have a chance to bring ideas to the floor that we think the American people want. I will be glad to talk about one or two very long-term ideas with you, and if you can help us get your leadership to schedule them, I think you would find that my side is very willing to be bipartisan this year.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me just say this in fairness to the leadership: They certainly can speak for themselves, but you know that what was attempted at the end of the last session would not have met any test that you would expect it to meet, to come up with a series of very significant proposals that were not even reduced to writing and then suggest that they have got to be scheduled for floor action in 24 or 48 hours. The fact is you would not have sat by. You would have exhibited a persecution complex here on that kind of an issue.

Mr. GINGRICH. Wait a second. Senator GRAMM and I initially introduced the Economic Growth Act in July. It was scored by Treasury as being budget neutral, and Treasury and the Bush administration were willing to support it. The President supported it in the Senate in September, and we were very prepared to bring it up. Senator GRAMM got 39 votes in the Senate because he did get it to the floor. That was a bill that was around for 5 months, and it was scored by Treasury.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. How was it scored by the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Tax Committee?

Mr. GINGRICH. The Joint Tax Committee is a joke. They have no concept about the American economy.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. How was it scored by the Congressional Budget Office?

Mr. GINGRICH. I do not think it was scored by them. In fact, by the way, on the House Republican proposal in the last 2 weeks or the last week of the session, the Joint Tax Committee—and I thought this was totally outrageous propaganda—the Joint Tax Committee said, "Of the 13 provisions you have, we cannot score 11 of them. We do not have a model which explains them." Therefore, everything that was said on the floor by Democrats citing the Joint Tax Committee was 2 out of the 11 provisions.

On the Gramm-Gingrich bill, we went to Treasury, and we spent 4 months writing the bill. It was scored by experts, and I would point out that I believe it is correct to say that the bill which came out of the Ways and Means Committee today uses OMB scoring, and the last unemployment bill used OMB scoring. And if you use OMB-Treasury scoring, the Gramm-Gingrich bill was budget neutral and in fact paid for itself.

That bill could have been brought up. I am not saying you ought to vote for it and you ought to pass it. I am just saying that in simple decency, in the name of bipartisanship, you at least ought to bring it to the floor.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Let me just make this observation: The hood ornament on your proposal has been—and is always—a capital gains cut, believing that the engine of economic progress is to give the rich a little something and somehow the rest will be better off. The fact is that you know and I know that the proposals as

scored would have been a net budget loser and would have increased the budget deficit in order to give the rich a very significant tax cut in this country. We have dealt with this before. We have had votes on this in this Congress, and you know that. This is not a new issue.

Mr. GINGRICH. And it passed the House.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. It sure did.

Mr. GINGRICH. And the Senate Democratic leadership deliberately killed it 1989.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. They did indeed.

Mr. GINGRICH. I am just pointing that out to you.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That was the democratic process.

Mr. GINGRICH. It was the democratic process in the sense that strangulation in the Senate is legitimate if you can get away with it. But the fact is that in a democratic process the President elected by all the people favored it, 264 Members of the House favored it, a majority of the Senate favored it, and it was procedurally killed. That is exactly why I am standing here saying this. You are making my point. The reason I am standing here, if I might proceed for a second, and saying this is to make the case that when the President comes in tonight, with 8.5 million unemployed, during a recession, and he makes a set of proposals, I am perfectly willing for Senator MITCHELL to schedule his bill and the President's; I am perfectly willing for Speaker FOLEY to schedule his bill and the President's; but let us get them to the floor. Let us get them to a vote. You know and I know that if it comes up in the Senate, it is going to pass, and if it comes up over here, my bet is that it is going to pass here.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I would only ask this of you: I think it is time for all of us to take a deep breath and wait a little bit before we get the big guns out and start firing ammunition across everybody's bow. This is the first day of the session. This country is in deep trouble. The President is going to come here tonight, and at least I am going to listen to him with an open mind. I hope some of his recommendations, some of which I have heard, are going to meet with my approval and the approval of a broad majority of my colleagues.

But it seems to me that it serves no interest for us to decide that we are right back in business as usual and we will just kick the slats out of everybody and somehow we will have a big political fight.

Mr. GINGRICH. No, I am not for kicking the slats out of everybody. I know this is very hard for Democrats to understand, because you have run the House for 5 years longer than Castro has run Cuba. It is very hard for us to appreciate that, being in the minority.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. And it is very hard for us to appreciate your having the White House. You have had it almost a quarter of a century except for 4 years.

Mr. GINGRICH. Well, we had 4 years of Jimmy Carter, and we thought that was enough.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. That was 4 years, yes, but you have had it for nearly a quarter of a century.

Mr. GINGRICH. But let me explain the difference between being on your side of the plantation and being on our side of the plantation. You are saying this is the first day of the session. That is right. But I woke up as the Republican whip, and what do I learn? I learn that there is a multimillion dollar contingency fund I have never seen, which has never been audited, and which we have no understanding of, and I learn that we are spending $5,000 or $6,000 on elevators, to put marble floors in them, something I did not approve and Mr. MICHEL did not approve, and nobody on the Republican side touched that.

□ 1650

I learned that next week you are going to bring up—not you personally—the Democratic leadership has decided without consultation they are going to bring up an October surprise bill written narrowly to totally favor the Democrats, basically the Democratic National Committee's fishing expedition, with no ability to look into the Carter administration.

Then you come to me and say, "Now, let's not jump the gun."

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. You will find 100 things to be upset about. You always have and probably always will. I understand that.

Mr. GINGRICH. If we were doing that to you, would you not be a little upset?

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. I am telling you the White House does it to us every day, all the time. I can cite chapter and verse.

Mr. GINGRICH. The White House has no unaudited funds. We have an Intelligence Committee which audits the White House.

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. The only point I make tonight is we in Congress and this President have got to find a way to work together to put the country back on track. If we fall back into the same wagon run of partisan politics, we lose, and the American people lose.

Mr. GINGRICH. I agree with you. I am saying I hope in the next day or two Speaker FOLEY and Senator MITCHELL will set a schedule that I think will be good for America. I hope they tell us publicly, yes, we are going to pass a bill by March 1, or by March 10. That is all I am suggesting.

I think every American has a reasonable right to say to the Congress, "Don't take a break in February. Don't go wandering off until you have decided how you are going to help the economy."

We left here in November without passing a bill to help the economy. We saw the economy not recover. We saw unemployed citizens with an additional 3 months of being in pain, losing money, in some cases losing their home.

Then we return and we are now in a situation where I have seen in newspapers suggestions that the Democrats might get around to passing a bill in July.

Now, that is crazy. You cannot go to the unemployed people of America, to those Americans who are worried, and say to them, "The President is going to give you an address on January 28, and maybe we will get it passed by July." And this is an emergency?

I think we owe it to unemployed Americans, we owe it to the American business community, we owe it to those who create jobs, to pass an Economic Growth Act within the next 30 days.

I think Congress ought to announce publicly the schedule. We ought to know what dates the Committee on Ways and Means will mark up in the House. We ought to know what date it is going to come to the floor of the House. We ought to know what date the Senate Finance Committee will mark up and what date it will come to the floor of the Senate. We ought to know what the target is for the conference committee to report out a bill and send it to the President.

Hopefully, particularly as my friend from North Dakota said if we can work together in a bipartisan manner, work and try to solve this particular problem in such a way that we could all take a sense of pride that we were helping American workers and helping people get off of unemployment and creating an opportunity for jobs for everyone. Hopefully in that setting we could actually have a very positive bipartisan effort over the next 30 days, and I think we could restore confidence. I would like nothing better than to see a bipartisan effort that would truly be helpful.

My friend was making the point we have to deal with long-term problems. I think, frankly, cutting wasteful Government spending is a very big part of long-term problems.

I ran into an article in Reader's Digest this month that is so astonishing that I wanted to share it as an example for all of my colleagues in the Congress of the scale of problems we are faced with.

There was an article in the January Reader's Digest entitled "How Unions Stole the Big Apple." by Rachel Flick. The subhead is: "Public employee unions have brought a great American city to its knees. Could it happen where you live?"

This article, which I am going to read in the RECORD, is a perfect example of the kind of wasteful Government spending which could be cut out, which would actually improve public service, improve the quality of life in our biggest cities, save money for the taxpayer, lower the deficit, and make us more able to compete in the world market.

Let me read the article, "How Unions Stole the Big Apple," by Rachel Flick. It goes as follows:

When principal Perry Sandler of New York City's Intermediate School 145 learned that custodian Al DeCiantis would be assigned to his school, he called DeCiantis' former school. The other principal could not have been happier that the man was leaving. DeCiantis, Sandler would find out, "goes by the contract"—the four words that strike dread in the heart of every New York public-school principal.

The custodians' work rules—thanks to Local 891 of the International Union of Operating Engineers—require DeCiantis to sweep only every other day and to mop only three times a year. Cafeteria floors must be mopped just once a week, even though the cafeteria at I.S. 145 handles five lunch shifts a day and serves as a classroom after that. In those classes, says Sandler, "the kids pretty much learn around filth." In the rest of the school, squads of students and teachers pick up trash the custodian won't.

For work like this, New York's school custodians average $57,000 per year.

Let me stop for a second and repeat that, because it is so extraordinary. The work rules for New York City's public schools require the janitor to sweep every other day and to mop three times—not a week, not a month, not a quarter—a year. Three times a year.

For sweeping every other day, for mopping three times a year, they are paid $57,000 a year.

The next time you hear a big city mayor tell you they haven't raised taxes enough on the middle class, on hard-working Americans, the next time you hear big city mayors ask you when is the Government in Washington going to send us more money, just ask yourself, do you want your taxes raised to subsidize a $57,000-a-year janitor who sweeps every other day and mops three times a year?

Let me go on.

With part-time contracts at other public schools, some boost their salaries as high as $80,000 and pad them with taxpayer-subsidized equipment—from weed-cutters to Jeeps—that after five years is theirs to keep.

Custodians are not the only New York City employees whose union-negotiated contracts beggar and infuriate taxpayers. By 1990, there were 353,000 people, from police officers to teachers, on the city payroll. Their collectively bargained labor contracts cost the city $13.3 billion a year. That's bigger than the budgets of 47 states.

By May 1990, a $3.5-billion budget deficit threatened the city with bankruptcy. Yet even in this emergency, public-employee unions resisted efficiencies, refusing—in the words of Teamster leader Barry Feinstein—"to be cowed by the fiscal crisis." The bottom line as one city manager sees it: "The unions have a stranglehold on New York."

How have public-employee unions brought one of America's great cities to its knees?

1. Contracts that guarantee bloat. According to the independent Citizen Budget Commission, in 1989 New York was forced to employ nearly 40 percent more workers per capita than other large cities to do the same work.

Let me emphasize that point. According to the Citizens Budget Commission, in 1989 the city of New York had 40 percent more workers to do the same volume of work as other major cities. Forget the fact that the other major cities are not very efficient—that is, that Detroit, Cleveland, Philadelphia, and Washington, DC, are not themselves very efficient. You are talking about 40 percent more workers than the already inefficient cities. These are folks who want to raise our taxes to ship the money to New York.

Ten years ago, for example, three men rode on New York City's garbage trucks. Two could do the job, and eliminating the third would save $30 million a year. But the Uniformed Sanitationmen's Association was opposed. To bring the union around, New York made a deal that plagues it to this day.

The city promised to kick back 25 percent of the savings from two-man trucks to the remaining workers. Today, those bonuses cost taxpayers $16.5 million per year. And New York promised that it would reduce the number of garbage trucks it sent out each day unless the union agreed.

In 1986, New York added recycling trucks to its sanitation force. Because the union would not agree to the number of regular trucks being cut back, many sanitation routes became substantially lighter and briefer. Today many $40,000-a-year sanitation workers finish their work in as little as four hours and spend the rest of their salaried day lifting weights and relaxing.

Let me emphasize. Reader's Digest is asserting the $40,000 a year sanitation workers work 4 hours a day. Now why should I raise taxes on a $25,000 a year worker in Georgia in order to subsidize a $40,000 a year worker who is working 4 hours a day?

Let me go on.

Maximum time off. The average New York City employee works considerably less time than his private-sector counterpart. An entry-level worker gets three weeks of paid vacation his first year on the job. That's on top of 12 days' sick leave and 12 holidays. Most private sector workers get only seven to nine holidays. After 15 years, city employees get a total of 51 days off.

□ 1700

Yet giving every employee just 1 day off costs taxpayers $4.2 million.

New York City teachers have even more generous schedules. And because the school year is short, an estimated 40 percent have second jobs.

Alexander Levy began teaching English in New York City's public schools in 1963. His salary when he retired this year was $52,750. For this he worked 180 days a year, 6 hours and 20 minutes per day, including lunch and preparatory periods. This schedule left him time for second jobs in the afternoons and summers.

In 1978 Levy took a year's sabbatical to work on his doctorate. In 1983 he took a second sabbatical to travel the country developing a private student counseling business that he ran while teaching. Through both sabbaticals, the city continued to pay Levy 60 to 70 percent of his salary.

Levy took a retirement incentive that gave him pension credit for 3 more years of work than he put in. As a retiree, he is thus entitled to $40,800 a year. For life. He is 55.

3. Resisting discipline. In 1989, the United Parcel Service complained to New York City's Department of Investigation that its trucks were getting billed for parking tickets they never received. In an undercover investigation, the DOI observed traffic enforcement agents writing phantom tickets while they loitered in restaurants or browsed through luxury stores.

How could city employees have ignored their duties so brazenly? For one thing, those in charge of watching the traffic agents are members of the same union. Not surprisingly, investigators found that the traffic agents' supervisors made "infrequent and ineffectual field visits." What's more, even to reprimand a worker, an agency must serve him with written charges. The employee is entitled to a hearing, to representation by his union or a lawyer and to call witnesses in his behalf.

4. Protecting their turf. Unionized city employees don't just object to private competition—they fight it. Last June the Astoria Pool, a public swimming pool in the Borough of Queens, was getting a badly needed coat of paint from the Mayor's City Volunteer Corps. The CVC organizes teenagers, many of them school dropouts, to work on city projects for carfare, lunch money and work experience.

But before the CVC could finish the pool, Al Carrozza, president of Local 1969 of the Civil Service Painters' Union, appeared on the scene and told the youths that the work they were doing was dangerous and illegal. The volunteers "stopped right way," says John Ciaffone, Assistant Commissioner of the Parks Department. The job then had to be finished by unionized employees.

Unions do not shy from strong-armed tactics. Last August, the New York City Transit Authority was ordered to pay $1 million in damages because its unionized members had harassed a private van service that competed with public transportation. The service's "crime": vans that offered bathrooms, TVs and phones, carrying 800 commuters a day for a lower fare than city buses.

5. Illegal strikes. Walkouts by public employees are unlawful, but they happen and are so disruptive that the mere threat of one can frighten city officials into costly concessions.

On August 13, 1990, members of the Corrections Officers Benevolent Association went on strike and blockaded the bridge leading to the city's 9-jail complex on Riker's Island. The union blockade snarled traffic for miles and trapped health and corrections officers on duty inside the jails. On its second day, inmates and guards clashed, and blood was shed.

Mayor Dinkins was furious at what "sure in blazes" looked like a violation of the law against strikes. Nevertheless, he swiftly compromised with the union, and the walkout and blockade ended. Police were never called, and the no-strike law was never invoked.

Other unions observed this outcome with interest. Just under two months later, on October 1, the teachers' contract was due to ex-

pire. The Mayor, already fearing a recession, had pledged no-wage increases above 1.5 percent. But United Federation of Teachers President Sandra Feldman threatened to strike. Again Dinkins yielded, granting the 85,000 UFT employees a 5.5-percent pay hike. Soon Dinkens found it impossible to deny to other unions what he had given the teachers. Last January Dinkins granted the Teamsters and District Council 37 a wage and benefit hike of 5 percent over 15 months.

Those agreements were reached with unions that helped elect and can certainly help defeat the Mayor. "Mr. Mayor, labor put you in" a union protester's sign warned Dinkins outside City Hall last June. "Labor can put you out."

When the City and its unions strike such deals, the taxpayer is forced to pick up the bill. Last year, New Yorkers experienced the highest single year tax hike in City history. Even New York Governor Mario Cuomo, a longtime union friend, is growing impatient. Writing in The New York Times, Cuomo protested that wage hike plans for public employees would come out of the hides of "poor and working class people."

Union leaders say they want to pay for wage hikes by raising taxes on "the rich." But the wealthiest 7 percent already pay 50 percent of the City's personal income taxes. In July, New York Times columnist A. M. Rosenthal warned that if extorted further, the affluent would flee New York, taking their taxable dollars with them. "Expecting them to go on paying ever more to live in a smelly, dangerous city that gives them ever less is not boosterism," he wrote. "It's arrogance."

New York taxpayers may finally have reached their limit. "Put succinctly," says Allen J. Proctor, Executive Director of the State Financial Control Board, "New York's economy cannot generate enough tax revenues to pay for its current mix of city services."

26 States, the District of Columbia and thousands of localities have passed collective bargaining laws enabling their employees to organize. As labor's influence in the private sectors has eroded, it has thrown its money and manpower into recruiting public employees. By 1990, 36.5 percent of public sector workers carried union cards, compared with just 12 percent in the private sector. Since 1983, membership in public employee unions has climbed more than 13 percent, to nearly 6.5 million.

Many American cities, New York among them, have learned the basic difference between unionizing a public versus a private work force. If a private sector manager negotiates too generous a contract with his employees, a more efficient competitor will put him out of business. The government has no competitors, and public employee unions know that—and business and individual taxpayers are stuck with the tab.

No American city is as tightly controlled by its unionized workforce as New York. But as employee unions gain strength in other cities, their members' political clout will grow with them, putting those cities at risk of the tragic financial decisions New York has made. That's why many forward-looking localities are moving to transfer a broad range of public services to private contractors.

A survey of 82 cities in 34 states found that each city had privatized something; 97 percent were happy they had done so; 100 percent had saved money—an average of about 25 percent; and 45 percent said the work done by contractors was better.

Let me stop for a second. Of those cities that privatized work, 100 percent had saved money on the privatized work and 25 percent was the average savings, 25 percent less.

If my choice is to cut Government spending by 25 percent for the same work or to raise taxes by 25 percent, I know which way I would personally rather go and that is to cut wasteful Government spending. Let me go on quoting from the article.

Phoenix privatized trash collection as early as 1978. Its own sanitation department bid for the work alongside the independents. At first, the department lost the right to collect trash in fully half the city. But by 1987 it had beaten the contractors at the efficiency game. By then, the city had saved $16.2 million.

In 1989 Chicago privatized the towing of abandoned cars. As a result, says Mayor Richard M. Daley, "A service that cost Chicago millions has netted more than $1.2 million over the last year." In 1990 Daley privatized parking ticket collections and gained taxpayers 12 million. Chicago has also successfully privatized some drug abuse treatment and janitorial services.

Last July Mayor Dinkins suggested for the first time that some privatization might make sense for New York City. The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees promptly attacked the idea, but the battle has been joined. If real reform emerges from the fray, the city's economic crisis may have provided a valuable lesson to all America.

The point of the Reader's Digest article in January, "How Unions Stole the Big Apple," is very simple. We in this Congress are faced with a challenge of replacing the welfare state across-the-board, of going to workfare as it affects people who are getting money without working for it, of insisting on efficient, effective contracts in city government, if we are going to send Federal money to cities, on rethinking the entire Federal bureaucracy to make it more effective.

I hope this can be done on a bipartisan basis. I hope that we can pass the President's economic growth plan as quickly as possible to put people back to work, to get out of the recession.

I hope we can work together on a dramatic, indeed, I would say a revolutionary budget this spring. So that we can truly reform the system to truly cut out wasteful Government spending. And I think if we can do that, we can establish the base for an America to be prosperous and successful in the world market and we can ensure that our children have the kind of prosperity that Americans have had in our lifetime.

□ 1710

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE SCOTT DOUGLASS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. PELOSI] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I heard that the President's budget was being reconsidered. In light of that I would like to make a pitch to the President to put a higher number in there for biomedical research for AIDS. Dr. Fauci, whom President Bush called a hero in the debates, as you may recall, requested $1,329,000,000, and the request that the President put in the budget is $873 million; considerably less, in fact one-third less, than Dr. Fauci's request. This comes at a time when scientists say this is the year we must push President Bush and the Congress to support further research.

We have marked a milestone this past week with the 200,000th case of AIDS; 100,000 cases of AIDS took 7 years. Now in just 2 years we have an additional 100,000 cases of AIDS, 137 new cases per day, 5.7 an hour, 1 every 10 minutes.

In San Francisco, we have 11,600-plus cases, and one of those is my good friend Scott Douglass. I rise, Mr. Speaker, in honor of Scott Douglass. Scott Douglass died at age 34. He was an aide to President Carter when he was 19 years old, and President Carter said of him last week that he was deeply impressed by Mr. Douglass' intelligence, his youthful exuberance, and his integrity. "Scott," the President said, "has remained very close to me and my family, and is a very special friend."

On behalf of my constituents and many of Scott's friends in San Francisco, I want to extend our gratitude to President Carter for his kind remarks, our condolences to his mother, Norma Douglass, his sister, Cynthia Wells, and Nancy Allen, of Roanoke, and also on his behalf to request that the President increase the AIDS budget.

HONORING W.R. "WITT" STEPHENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker; today all of the Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Arkansas have joined in requesting this special order to commemorate the life and accomplishments of W.R. "Witt" Stephens of Arkansas.

On February 1, 1973, we held a special order to note my uncle's remarkable career as he retired from his position as president and chairman of the board of the Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co. to rejoin his brother, Jack, in their many enterprises.

While president of ARKLA, Witt accepted the traditional responsibilities to stockholders, employees, and consumers, but he also created a new program to provide an opportunity for a fourth group of people—those who, in Witt's words, "need a boost just to get to a place where thay can start making it on their own."

As I remarked to my colleagues in the House on that occasion nearly 20 years ago, my uncle Witt Stephens was not withdrawing into retirement but moving toward new goals and the acceptance of new challenges.

He had pledged to continue working for the economic development of our region and for a higher quality of life, better jobs, better training, and better opportunities for the young, the unemployed, and those who need help.

Much has been written about Witt Stephens' business successes. His father, A.J. Stephens, known as Papa to all the family, believed in the value of hard work and that anyone's word should be his bond. He told Witt that, "Poverty is nothing to be proud of, or ashamed of, but to be gotten rid of as quickly as conveniently possible."

Starting with a few thousand dollars earned by selling belt buckles for the National Craft Co., Witt established W.R. Stephens Investment Co. in 1933. From 1946, he and his brother, Jack, were partners in the firm which not only achieved remarkable success, but also played a significant role in the startup or expansion of such companies as Federal Express, Systematics, Alltel, Tyson Foods, and Wal-Mart, among many others.

In 1959, Witt Stephens was Fortune magazine's cover story in an article which stated that he, ". . . is generally counted by Arkansas businessmen and politicians as one of the outstanding natural wonders of their State. For one thing," noted Fortune, "his career presents the gratifying spectacle of a local country boy who has made good."

Father George Tribou, a frequent guest at Witt's famous lunches, said at Witt's memorial services that he knew Witt as a family man, as Witt Jr.,'s father, and as a friend, and that it was not enough to say that Witt was a country boy who came to town and made good. Rather, "He was a country boy who came to town and was good."

Dr. Billy White, pastor of the Second Baptist Church in Little Rock and Witt's minister, suggested that those who had measured Witt's accomplishments by his business achievements missed the mark.

Papa would agree, pointing out that success is not measured by the attainment of an objective but in the quality of the journey. He often told all the family that:

It's not who you are born
But how do you live.
Not how much do you have,
But how much do you give.
These are the measures
That determine the worth
Of anyone's life,
Regardless of birth.

While Witt Stephens' business successes are well known, his generosity in support of education and health care programs has not been so widely reported. He provided substantial support to the Baptist Medical Center, St. Vincent's Hospital, and the University of Arkansas medical science campuses in Little Rock. He also made significant endowments to many Arkansas colleges and universities, and celebrated individual excellence by rewarding outstanding teachers and students.

By the measure suggested by Papa, we have all been enriched by Witt Stephens' life.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER].

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I want to join this evening to honor a great citizen of our Nation and our State, W.R. "Witt" Stephens, whom all of us knew as a person of remarkable business acumen by his enormous success that he is widely known throughout the State, but for those of us involved in politics, we also must observe his political prowess which was widely acknowledged and respected.

I was on several occasions honored to have been invited to his famous business luncheon or luncheons, political fora, at Stephens, Inc., which became legendary throughout the State as a forum for thoughtful discussion on the subject of political matters and public policy and virtually everything else that went on around the State.

I recall specifically the first luncheon that I attended back in 1971, when Mr. Witt began to describe what he would call the forthcoming energy crisis. He told about how the organization of petroleum exporting countries was organizing themselves into a cartel that would offer the potential for managing and manipulating the world oil supply, and how the United States, having no energy policy and an unbridled consumption of oil and other energy products, was playing into the trap that was being set by OPEC.

□ 1720

Being a young Congressman, I was somewhat skeptical at that time, because everyone knew Mr. Witt was in the gas business, and I thought, "Uh-huh, here's a guy trying to raise the price of gas." But little did I know that this would become true, and in 1973 and 1974 when this country was gripped with the Arab oil boycotts that ultimately raised the price of energy over the next several years by about 400 percent that set forth a tidal wave of inflation that ran through the entire spectrum of the economy over the next 10 years, every time that Witt said something after that, I listened very carefully, because what he was trying to do was to raise an issue of public policy concern that would draw some attention from people engaged in public policy to offer insight on a subject that he was informed about in hopes of finding a long-range solution to the energy crisis which he forecast as coming true.

If we had listened to the words of Mr. Witt back in 1971, we would not be facing the economic crisis that we face today, because just during the decade of the 1980's, the Department of Commerce has reported that this Nation consumed $1,200,000,000,000 in foreign energy purchases during the decade of the 1980's, and that what made it even worse is that we had to borrow money from foreigners in order to buy the energy from foreigners. Oh, how I wish that we had listened to the words of Mr. Witt, because the speech of the President who will address the Nation on the State of the Union this evening would be a different speech entirely.

I believe that at the roots of our economic crisis is the failure to establish a national energy policy that has sapped the energy and the vitality of our economy, as your Uncle Witt was trying to describe to us.

I have observed many people have noticed Mr. Witt's achievements and his contributions to the state of the Nation, and one that I would like to insert as an appendage to my remarks was written by our dear friend, and the person that we all admire, a circuit judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals, Judge Richard Arnold, who has contributed to an article published on the editorial page in the Arkansas Democrat-Gazette on December 5, 1991, captioned "Mr. Witt," and, Mr. Speaker, I am inserting that at this point in the RECORD.

MR. WITT

W.R. Stephens left us on Monday. We are sad at the loss of a friend, but we rejoice in a life well lived. A few thoughts come to mind about Mr. Witt.

He was best known to the public as a giant of business, a financial genius, the man who could sell anything—Bibles, or belt buckles, or bonds. This reputation was deserved. No one person did more to build the economy of Arkansas in the second half of this century. His role matched that of Harvey Couch in the first half.

Other traits and qualities, perhaps, were more important. To begin with, Mr. Witt was, and had, a lot of fun. He saw the humor of the human condition. He was interested in everything and loved to talk about it. Every day a group of friends would come to lunch. The host reveled in the talk. Politics, sports, history, people, religion were the topics. Nothing was out of bounds. The problems of the world were settled every day. The next day they needed settling again.

The sparkling salons of 18th-century Paris had nothing on Mr. Witt's luncheon table. Two names stand out among the guests: Ike Murry, politician, raconteur, humorist, businessman, who has now welcomed his friend into Paradise; and Henry Woods, judge and polymath, source of Arkansas political history without peer, unerring commentator on current affairs.

But Mr. Witt wasn't about just talk, marvelous as it was. Loyalty was his long suit—to Arkansas, to friends, to family—above all, to family. The prayer customarily said before lunch by his son contained the words, "Bless our family. Bless our friends."

"Family and friends," the father would say, "that covers it all."

Nor was he a fair-weather friend. He was loyal even—perhaps especially—to friends in trouble. There was no such thing as a lost soul to him. Those convicted of crime were to be helped, not spurned. He believed in the dignity of every human being—even the man who kidnapped and almost killed him, and whom Mr. Witt later helped many times.

It is hard to find the right words to describe Mr. Witt. Kindness, benevolence come close. The image of the financial octopus controlling a state—propagated by those who did not know him—was a false image. As a husband, a father, a partner, a fellow citizen, he wanted most to encourage the freedom and independence of others. All you needed was a handshake. The phrase, "put it in writing," never had to be said. His business successes were well-known. Less so were his benefactions. He ran a public utility at a handsome profit, but would never cut off heat in winter to a customer who asked him for help. He had a genuine talent for friendship, with big shots and biscuit cookers, governors and the down-and-out.

Volumes could be, and one hopes will be, written about him. But if they miss the central role of faith in his life, they will miss the mark. A Bible (the King James version, of course) was always on his desk. At lunch, the conversation would often turn to God. Who will be saved? Why? How hard will it be to get through that needle's eye? On one occasion about two weeks before his last illness he asked, "What will the life after death be like? (Not, please note, whether there is one, but what will it be like?) The guests tried to answer. One, the Rev. Dr. Billy White of Second Baptist Church, Mr. Witt's pastor, gave the best answer: The old body will be done away, but the person will survive, recognizing others and being recognized as an individual child of God. Mr. Witt seemed to like that. He wanted to see his father, A.J. Stephens (like his son, once a member of the Arkansas House of Representatives), again. He had a sure and certain hope, and those present that day believe he has not been disappointed.

One word sums up the character of the man. That word is love. He had a heart of flesh. He loved people, and they loved him. What's more, he could show it, either in deed or in word, simply by saying to a friend, "I love you." When you got a letter signed, "Your friend, Witt," you knew he meant it. It was not just a pleasant phrase. God is love, and God was in Witt Stephens.

St. John of the Cross said that in the end we shall be judged on love. If this is true, Mr. Witt does not fear the judgment.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my distinguished colleague, the dean of our Arkansas congressional delegation, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT].

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Witt Stephens, who was one of a kind and truly a great citizen in the State of Arkansas. I had the honor of knowing him for over 25 years and treasured his advice and wise counsel. Even though we wore different political party labels, I always found his ideas sound and many times inspirational.

He was a man who looked to the future not only for our State but for the betterment of its individual citizens. When he was chairman of the Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co., back in the late 1960's, I would often pass through Little Rock en route to my district on Friday afternoons and find Mr. Witt holding court in the Coachman's Inn and I treasure the conversations we had at those roundtable coffee house meetings.

Shortly before Mr. Witt died, I had the pleasure of visiting with him on two separate occasions. In the last months before his passing I had been unable to attend luncheons that he had asked me to so I am particularly pleased that I had those last discussions with him because he was a man who always left you feeling good about yourself, with his upbeat attitude and inspirational personality.

I know he was especially proud of his younger brother Jack, who joined him in the family business. As partners, Jack and Witt Stephens built an empire that has touched many lives.

I would also like to mention his four children—Elizabeth, Pam, Frances, and Witt Jr.—his six grandchildren and five great-grandchildren. I know they were a source of great pride and pleasure to Mr. Witt.

Incidentally, just last spring Witt Jr. was honored as the most outstanding student of the College of Business upon his graduation from the University of Arkansas. I feel that I should also mention that we take pride that Mr. Witt's nephew Ray Thornton is one of our distinguished colleagues.

The Stephens family have long been advocates of the University of Arkansas. In fact, Witt Sr. and Jack were among the early supporters of the Razorbacks athletic program. There have been many articles written about Mr. Witt and the unusual Stephens family. I am including one of them with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I submit excerpts from an article in Arkansas Business on Witt Stephens by Mr. Leroy Donald.

[From the Arkansas Business, Dec. 9, 1991]

EXCERPTS FROM "REMEMBERING MISTER WITT"

(By Leroy Donald)

For all his wealth and power, Mister Witt belonged to the "biscuit cookers," a term he used for residential customers who used his Arkla gas to cook.

The term has become a synonym for the little man everywhere.

He was Arkansas' own, a son of Grant County, a hard-driving businessman who was known in every community in his state and, of necessity, by every politician from city council members to governors.

A colorful character, he reveled in his country-boy ways, a lot of them put on for pure show.

He could snooker a New York broker every time, it was claimed, and some of the greatest of the many anecdotes on Mister Witt revolved around Wall Street meetings.

* * * * *

Stephens was an unabashed capitalist, never ashamed of making money. He probably had few waking moments when he was not thinking of some way to do so.

One of his favorite sayings about wealth was, "My daddy told me poverty wasn't anything to be ashamed of, but to be got rid of as soon as conveniently possible."

* * * * *

He started his business career in the 1920's, operating a shoe-shine stand and a roasted peanut business in downtown Sheridan, mostly on Saturdays.

The rest of the time as a youth he was a farm laborer, picking cotton, baling hay and tending livestock.

In 1927, his father called Witt's attention to an advertisement in a national publication about openings for novelty jewelry salesmen for the National Craft Co. of Providence, R.I. Mister Witt responded to the ad and proceeded to saturate Sheridan and other towns in the area with novelty jewelry, mostly belt buckles.

When he enrolled a short time later in the old Citizen Military Training Corps and was assigned to Fort Leavenworth in Kansas, he took his sample kit and order forms.

And one of the great Witt Stephens legends was born.

He persuaded the paymaster's squad to permit him to set up a desk at the end of the pay line, where he sold buckles for $3.50 each. This gave him the appearance of acting in an official capacity. Most of the recruits meekly forked over the $1 down payment, which also was his commission on each buckle.

He made $2,600 in two days.

In later years, Stephens claimed his career as a salesman was anchored in that experience.

The jewelry company was so impressed with Stephens that it made him a regional sales manager, and he began working the Southwest. He added Bibles to his line.

But the Great Depression worsened, and Witt Stephens headed home. He was 26 years old.

His father, who served in the Legislature, had counseled his children to participate in politics. During one of his discussions with his son, the elder Stephens talked about the sad condition of the state's finances after total default of the bonded indebtedness...[C]onvinced the state's bonds, especially improvement and school-district bonds, would become marketable when the nation's economy improved...Stephens moved to Little Rock and obtained a sales job with a bond house. Three months later, he established the W.R. Stephens Investment Co., the foundation on which his wealth and personal reputation as a trader were built.

From 1933 until 1945, Stephens traded in all kinds of property, acquiring bank stock, farms, livestock, automobiles and even a hotel in Prescott. Mister Witt also involved himself in all kinds of political activities and enlarged his profile as an entrepreneur by visiting every bank, courthouse and city hall in Arkansas.

The public relations effort served him well the rest of his life.

In 1940, he aligned himself with Homer M. Adkins and gave time and money for the successful Adkins campaign for governor. It was this venture, he later conceded, that convinced him politics was good for business as well as fun.

It was during the Adkins administration (1941–44) that the state's credit was restored by the refunding of defaulted highway debts.

In 1945, Stephens acquired Arkansas Oklahoma Gas Co., a small, financially troubled utility serving Fort Smith and the surrounding area. He renamed it the Fort Smith Gas Corp. and subsequently established Stephens Production Co., an oil and gas exploration

firm, on the utility's limited reserves. Later, the utility was named Arkansas Oklahoma Gas Corp.

Stephens' legend began to spread nationwide as he made appearances before Securities and Exchange Commission examiners. A consummate actor, he confounded government experts with his ignorant-country-boy act.

One of the great, perhaps apocryphal, stories involves his first visit to the SEC, when he was buying the Fort Smith company. The commission's staff was trying to prove Stephens was not financially able to take over the company.

"You need $150,000 up front to complete this deal," an examiner told him. "Do you have access to that much?"

Mister Witt, it is said, reached in his pocket and pulled out a cashier's check. Then, he said in his best Grant County drawl, "I figured you would ask that, so I just brung it with me."

During the next decade, Stephens was busy on several fronts, most notably the oil and gas industry and Arkansas politics. He enlarged the gas utility and added to the holdings of the production company.

Stephens learned that Cities Service Co. has been directed by the government to divest itself of two gas utilities, one of them being Arkansas Louisiana Gas Co. Most of Arkla's customers were in Arkansas, although the company also served Louisiana and east Texas.

Witt and Jack set about acquiring the publicly held Arkla stock and in the fall of 1954 succeeded in gaining control of the utility. Two years later, Witt Stephens was elected to the Arkla board. He later was named chairman of the board and president of the company.

He turned the investment company over to his brother and a few trusted associates, retaining supervision of his utility properties and oil and gas production.

At the time, Stephens Inc. had a multimillion-dollar inventory and a portfolio that included majority stocks in at least four Arkansas banks and holdings in 28 others.

Under Mister Witt's management, Arkla acquired two other utility companies, extending operations into Kansas, Oklahoma, and south Texas.

From 1956 through 1972, Arkla expanded from a conventional utility to a manufacturing and processing company. Basing his planning largely on the utilization of natural gas and other natural resources found in Arkansas, Stephens directed Arkla into fertilizer, chemical, cement, plywood and applicance manufacturing.

He spotted some gas lamps outside a restaurant in New Orleans and felt home owners would like them in their yards. He re-established gas lighting for both decorative and utilitarian purposes across Arkansas.

Stephens also prodded Arkla researchers to create the now nationally known and used outdoor gas grill.

Along the way, he was instrumental in bringing manufacturing and processing plants to many Arkansas towns.

Despite his affinity for politics, Stephens ran for only one public office, as a Democrat for state representative from Grant County. He served two terms beginning in 1961. Although Stephens had enough pledges to become House speaker, he declined.

Stephens served two years as chairman of the State Hospital Board, an appointment by Gov. Orval E. Faubus.

When Faubus first ran for governor in 1954, Stephens backed incumbent Francis Cherry. After that, he became one of Faubus' chief backers . . . Beginning in the early 1940's, Stephens participated in every gubernatorial and senatorial campaign—and many lesser races—as a fund-raiser and occasionally as the entire finance committee. He made a point to have every member of the Arkansas House and Senate to lunch at least once every two years in his private dining room.

The Stephens Inc. dining room was the scene for meetings with bankers, industrialists, coaches, nationally acclaimed athletes, media representatives, jurists, farmers and just friends.

It was in his dining room that Stephens raised funds for the presidential campaigns of Jimmy Carter and John Glenn. Until recent years, he was a yellow-dog Democrat.

After his 1973 retirement from Arkla, Stephens expressed interest in running for governor. Even though there was substantial favorable response, he abandoned the idea when family and friends convinced him such a contest would be chancy and exhausting.

Mister Witt was a favorite source of copy for three generations of reporters and was highly accessible. (He once owned 29 percent of the Arkansas Gazette). Reporters from East Coast newspapers and magazines were awed by his grasp of economics and loved his down-home expressions.

Not all his dreams came to pass.

When Stephens learned in 1968 that the famed London Bridge was to be dismantled, he proposed buying it and reassembling it at an Arkansas River crossing near London in Pope County. A company was formed, but the project was never feasible from an engineering standpoint. The bridge ended up in Arizona.

More recently, Stephens and his brother sought unsuccessfully to acquire the merging First National and Commercial National Banks of Little Rock through a stock tender.

Stephens observed after one such failure, "You can't win 'em all. We'll try something else."

A short time after the abortive bank bid, the brothers gained control of Worthen Banking Corp., the holding company for several banks, including what is now Worthen National Bank of Arkansas in Little Rock.

When Mister Witt turned Stephens Inc. over to his brother in 1957 and went to Arkla, he also decided farming was a better deal than he thought in his youth.

He started putting together acreage, including that which embraced his birthplace near Prattsville. He developed a farm of almost 2,500 acres on which he had almost 1,000 cattle.

It was his habit to leave the downtown Little Rock office after lunch with his friends and drive to the farm. It wasn't unusual for Stephens to take a visitor or two with him and put them to work rounding up cattle, picking vegetables from his garden or mending fences.

Stephens would spend most Saturdays at his home in Prattsville, holding court with Grant County residents on the front porch and eating midday dinners of vegetables grown on his farm.

Following retirement from Arkla, Stephens acquired several thousand acres of ranch and farmland in other Arkansas counties . . . He was a regular donor to many charities and was the co-chairman of the Baptist Medical Center's building fund campaign. Although Witt Stephens eschewed publicity when it came to his private philanthropies, his gift giving was legion.

Also legion were the stories about him. Some weren't true. But most were.

Mister Witt was a legend in the truest sense of the word.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ANTHONY], who represents the Fourth Congressional District, where Grant County is located.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say thank you to my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], who several years ago decided to vacate the Fourth Congressional District to let another young, ambitious politician take a crack at following him to Congress.

Successfully having been elected in 1978, I became good friends with your uncle, Mr. Witt.

Grant County, out of 23 counties in the Fourth Congressional District, is the second smallest, but in terms of notoriety in the State of Arkansas, is one of the largest because of the presence of Witt Stephens and the fact that he bragged so much about being from Grant County, Sheridan being the county seat. He has a family farm and a lovely home in Prattsville.

His son Witt, Jr., was in Sheridan speaking to the Rotary Club not long ago, and it appears that he has inherited his father's sense of humor. He said that his father often told him that if you are good when you die, you will go to Grant County; if you are really good, you will go to Prattsville.

Unlike my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ALEXANDER], I got to know him not from being Witt the entrepreneur who started off from meager circumstances to become one of the most wealthy individuals in the United States, a dedicated husband, a very fine father, but I got to know Mr. Witt from a friendship standpoint, someone who would look out and see a young politician and want to get to know him better. I had the privilege, with my wife, of going to his farm on numerous occasions. When I say this, a lot of people probably will not understand how good it is, but to have fried okra, fresh peas, good country smothered steak, more iced tea than you can imagine, but then to hear his sage advice and how he would just very easily pump into you the ideals of being a good straightforward politician and a good public servant.

So I say to my good colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. THORNTON], the Stephens family is a family that has a strong reputation in the State of Arkansas, especially from the entrepreneurial standpoint, but I will always remember Witt Stephens from the standpoint of taking time to visit with and help encourage a young politician along the way and know that he also came from a line of legislators, his father having served in the State legis-

lature, he back in the 1960's saying that he would like to follow in his father's footsteps, and ran and served a couple of terms in the State legislature, thought about running for Governor and decided not to.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the RECORD I am including some excerpts from the Sheridan Headlight dated December 11, 1991, entitled, "A Man Called Witt * * *" by Jim Lancaster.

EXCERPTS FROM "A MAN CALLED WITT * * *"

(By Jim Lancaster)

Second Baptist Church Pastor, Billy White, spoke to a gathering of over 1000 people who loved and admired "MR. WITT." The pastor searched for words and metaphors to describe the man and his life and said, "A great tree has fallen from the Arkansas forest, and a lonely emptiness is left."

Father George Tribou, a Catholic Priest, eulogized Witt with humorous stories and experiences about him. He visualized Witt's entrance into eternity with Witt meeting St. Peter at heaven's gate and trying to sell him a belt buckle.

The funeral service was a "classy" but simple event, with the family and mourners at times breaking into laughter at the stories told about a man who had touched so many lives. It was uplifting and positive, as Witt would want it. The congregation sang "Count Your Blessings" and read the 23rd Psalm. The burial was at Philadelphia Cemetery at Prattsville, not far from Witt's farm and birthplace.

Without question, Witt Stephens was Grant County's most famous native son. Among those attending Witt's funeral were the most influential and powerful people of Arkansas and America. Governors, former Governors, Senators, University Presidents, Sports Coaches, Highway Commissioners, Bankers and Corporation Presidents attended. Pastor White even read a letter to Witt's family from evangelist Billy Graham, who was Witt's friend too.

Although he had worldwide interests, Witt maintained his love for Grant County. His, son, Witt Jr., recently spoke at the Sheridan Rotary Club and said his father had always told him, "If you're good and treat people right, when you die, you'll go to Grant County—and if you're really good, you'll go to Prattsville." Witt's good humor seems to be inherited by his children.

Father Tribou said at the funeral that the media always saw Witt as a financier and business giant—and what the media couldn't see was Witt the husband, Witt the father, Witt the brother, and Witt the friend.

Witt had many friends in Grant County, in fact, he considered every citizen his friend. In some way he touched the life of nearly every family in the County. And when people talked about his wealth and power, Witt frequently told his friends in high places, "I'm just a farmer from Grant County," and made them believe that Prattsville and Grant County must be the most wonderful place in the world.

Witt's mother was Ethel Pumphrey Stephens and his father was A.J. Stephens, affectionately known in the County as "Uncle Jack."

The character and determination of Witt's family was molded by the hardship of farm life in the early 20th century. The following is a quote from Ray Thornton's book, "A.J. Stephens, as Remembered by His Family":

". . . Jack and Ethel built a small house a couple of hundred yards away from Ethel's childhood home near Prattsville. The house consisted of one large room with a woodburning fireplace and a small side room attached. Into this small house on December 17, 1904, their first child, Albert Jennings, was born. . . . The next time an infant cry from the Stephens cabin greeted the dawn, on September 14, 1907, heralded the birth of a second boy, given the name of Wilton Aubert, later changed to Wilton Robert, and soon shortened to WITT."

When Witt became wealthy, he fulfilled a dream by building his parents a big, beautiful home in Prattsville with a pond in front.

Witt's brothers, Albert and Jack, and his sisters, Wilma, Jewell and Lois, all became remarkable people—each with their own strengths, and perhaps influenced positively by the farm life in a greater way than any of them ever imagined.

Witt's competitive spirit emerged while he was a child and lasted until his death. Whether picking cotton, playing basketball, selling belt buckles, selling bonds or politicking—he worked harder than anyone else, and therefore outperformed everyone else.

Throughout his business life, he related decisions to the farm, and he managed his business as he managed the farm—overcoming hardships and ever grateful for the experience and lessons those hardships taught him. . . . Through the years Witt brought many of his powerful friends and associates to his Prattsville farm. There, he proudly fed them garden vegetables and meat grown on the farm. Peas, okra, green beans and blueberries grown in his garden were canned and frozen while in season, so he could feed them to visitors instead of gourmet foods. . . . Witt's friends from the area visited him at the farm too, and were usually invited to lunch at his big table. Grant County people who needed a job often came to see him, and were usually helped if he felt they would work hard and do a good job if he recommended them.

In the 1950's when the Grant County leadership approached Witt about bringing some industry to the county to give some folks a job, Witt responded. His brother, Albert, was one of the original organizers of the Grant County Industrial Development Corporation. . . . With Witt's help, more than 500 new jobs were created in Sheridan, and Sheridan became the model of a small town in industrial development. He frequently talked with corporate executives about their plants that were not doing well. He told them that if they would move their plant to Grant County, Arkansas, we would show them some people that will work and do you a good job.

Witt's father served in the Arkansas Legislature as Representative from Grant County. One of Witt's ambitions was to serve in the legislature as had his father. In the '60's, Witt was elected to a couple of terms as Grant County Representative. . . . He considered running for Governor, but decided he would have to give up too many business interests to run. So he became a powerful force in deciding who would be a good governor, and then helping them to get elected.

His political ambition was realized too, by seeing his nephew, Ray Thornton, elected to the Congress of the United States.

Perhaps Witt's most unusual trait was his vision for the future. . . . His vision was centered in the power of the family and the influence of the church.

When asked what makes Grant County so great, he would usually say, "Good people, good families and good churches."

A man called "Witt" made a difference.

Mr. THORNTON. Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the privilege of knowing my Uncle Witt for more than 60 years. One of my earliest memories was that of believing he was letting me drive his first car, "Buckles" on the road from Leola to Prattsville.

My mother is now papa and mama's oldest surviving child, and I know she would want me to express our love for Witt's wife and children—Bess, Elizabeth, Pam, Frances, and Witt Jr.—and all of the members of the family.

We can fully understand that what has been well begun will require constant effort and vision to continue. My uncle's life was successful, but we know, whether in a family or in a nation, that from every success arises a greater challenge.

During the last weeks of his life, my uncle, through long hours of hard work, broke his own lifetime record of commissioned sales. Those around Witt were always amazed at his energy, his boundless appetite for books, and his curiosity about that the future might hold.

He was troubled by those who were always predicting the decline of America, and he wrote and circulated to friends and associates his own timeless observations about America's future. I would like to quote him for the RECORD:

Through the 200 years of American History, this country has been constantly besieged by bad news. If the early settlers had believed things were as bad as they sounded they would have given up the fight to settle the New World and sailed back to England, and the dream of freedom would have perished.

From that day to the present the people of this Nation have listened to the bad news for a while, then they turned their backs on that which was bad, placed their faith in God and faced toward that which was good.

Down through the years, through a tragic Civil War, two worldwide wars, a series of smaller conflicts, recession and the Great Depression of the 1930's we have heard again and again the words of citizen Tom Paine, "These are the times that try men's souls." In every case the people rejected the bad news and overcame whatever obstacle was facing them at that time.

Once again, we are put to the test. Everything we hear is bad. We are smothered with a never-ending succession of newspaper, radio and television reports on Watergate, drug abuse, crime in the streets, decadent morals and lack of honest and competent leadership. If citizen Tom Paine were alive today, he could well utter again his famous quotation.

It is impossible to lock your door against the invasion of the news media into every nook of your home and office. They don't make the news, they merely report it. Tell it as it is. We have the option of acceptance or rejection. We can bemoan what is happening in our world, wring our hands and cover our heads, or we can reject the bad and look about us to the good.

When I was a boy on a small farm in Grant County, news wasn't as quickly available as it is today and reached us mainly by word of mouth. A "drummer" would come by or one of our neighbors returned from a trip to Lit-

tle Rock or Memphis and we saw the news through their eyes. Mostly it was about what was bad in the big cities or throughout the country.

After listening a while, my father would say, "That's enough bad news for one day. Let's go to work." America has heard enough bad news for a while. Now is the time to go to work. Turn your back on the bad news and look around you at what is good. You don't need to look far. Your family, your children, your friends and neighbors, they are good.

We live today in the greatest country the world has ever known, filled with opportunities which never existed before. The highest standards of living, more leisure time, better health services, better schools, more jobs, finer homes and freedom to enjoy these wonders.

This is indeed the time to turn our backs on the bad news and face the future with thankfulness.

I have never known a greater man. We will miss him a lot, but he would tell us it is time to go to work.

□ 1730

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DERRICK). Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the House will stand in recess until approximately 8:40 p.m.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.) the House stood in recess until 8:40 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 8 o'clock and 39 minutes p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 28, 1992.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received at 6:42 p.m. on Tuesday, January 28, 1992, the following message from the Secretary of the Senate: That the Senate agreed to H. Con. Res. 267 without amendment.

With great respect, I am
Sincerely yours,
DONNALD K. ANDERSON,
Clerk, House of Representatives.

JOINT SESSION OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE HELD PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 267 TO HEAR AN ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The Speaker of the House presided.

The Doorkeeper, the Honorable James T. Molloy, announced the Vice President and Members of the U.S. Senate, who entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, the Vice President taking the chair at the right of the Speaker, and the Members of the Senate the seats reserved for them.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as members of the committee on the part of the House to escort the President of the United States into the Chamber:

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. GEPHARDT];

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR];

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER];

The gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO];

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS];

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL];

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH];

The gentleman from California [Mr. LEWIS];

The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDWARDS]; and

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The President of the Senate, at the direction of that body, appoints the following Senators as a committee on the part of the Senate to escort the President of the United States into the House Chamber:

The Senator from Maine [Mr. MITCHELL];

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. FORD];

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. PRYOR];

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIXON];

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBB];

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. FOWLER];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. DASCHLE];

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. DOLE];

The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON];

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. COCHRAN];

The Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. NICKLES];

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTEN];

The Senator from Texas [Mr. GRAMM]; and

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND].

The Doorkeeper announced the ambassadors, ministers and Chargé d'Affaires of foreign governments.

The ambassadors, ministers, and Chargé d'Affaires of foreign governments entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them.

The Doorkeeper announced the Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

The Doorkeeper announced the Cabinet of the President of the United States.

The members of the Cabinet of the President of the United States entered the Hall of the House of Representatives and took the seats reserved for them in front of the Speaker's rostrum.

At 9 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m., the Doorkeeper announced the President of the United States.

The President of the United States, escorted by the committee of Senators and Representatives, entered the Hall of the House of Representatives, and stood at the Clerk's desk.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

The SPEAKER. Members of the Congress, I have the high privilege and the distinct honor of presenting to you the President of the United States.

[Applause, the Members rising.]

THE STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 102–176)

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Speaker, Mr. President, distinguished Members of Congress, honored guests, and fellow citizens: Thank you very much for that warm reception. You know, with the big buildup this address has had, I wanted to make sure it would be a big hit, but I couldn't convince Barbara to deliver it for me.

I see the Speaker and the Vice President are laughing. They saw what I did in Japan and they are just happy they are sitting behind me.

I mean to speak tonight of big things; of big changes and the promises they hold, and of some big problems and how together we can solve them and move our country forward as the undisputed leader of the age.

We gather tonight at a dramatic and deeply promising time in our history, and in the history of man on earth.

For in the past twelve months the world has known changes of almost biblical proportions. And even now, months after the failed coup that doomed a failed system, I am not sure we have absorbed the full impact, the full import of what happened. But communism died this year.

Even as President, with the most fascinating possible vantage point, there were times when I was so busy managing progress and helping to lead change, that I didn't always show the joy that was in my heart.

But the biggest thing that has happened in the world in my life—in our lives—is this: By the grace of God, America won the Cold War.

I mean to speak this evening of the changes that can take place in our

country now that we can stop making the sacrifices we had to make when we had an avowed enemy that was a Superpower. Now we can look homeward even more, and move to set right what needs to be set right.

I will speak of those things. But let me tell you something I've been thinking these past few months. It's a kind of rollcall of honor. For the Cold War didn't "end"—it was won.

And I think of those who won it, in places like Korea, and Vietnam. And some of them didn't come back. Back then they were heroes, but this year they were: victors.

The long rollcall—all the G.I. Joes and Janes, all the ones who fought faithfully for freedom, who hit the ground and sucked the dust and knew their share of horror.

This may seem frivolous—I don't mean it so—but it's moving to me how the world saw them.

The world saw not only their special valor but their special style—their rambunctious, optimistic bravery, their do-or-die unity unhampered by class or race or region. What a group we've put forth, for generations now—from the ones who wrote "Kilroy was Here" on the walls of German stalags, to those who left signs in the Iraqi desert that said, "I Saw Elvis." What a group of kids we've sent out into the world.

And there's another to be singled out—though it may seem inelegant. I mean a mass of people called The American Taxpayer. No one ever thinks to thank the people who pay a country's bills, or an alliance's bills. But for half a century now the American people have shouldered the burden, and paid taxes that were higher than they would have been to support a defense that was bigger than it would have been if imperial communism had never existed.

But it did.

It doesn't anymore.

And here is a fact I wouldn't mind the world acknowledging: The American taxpayer bore the brunt of the burden, and deserves a hunk of the glory.

And so, now, for the first time in 35 years, our strategic bombers stand down. No longer are they on 'round-the-clock alert. Tomorrow our children will go to school and study history and how plants grow. And they won't have, as my children did, air raid drills in which they crawl under their desks and cover their heads in case of nuclear war. My grandchildren don't have to do that, and won't have the bad dreams children had once, in decades past. There are still threats. But the long, drawn out dread is over.

A year ago tonight I spoke to you at a moment of high peril. American forces has just unleashed Operation Desert Storm. And after forty days in the desert skies, and four days on the ground, the men and women of America's Armed Forces, and our allies, accomplished the goals that I declared, and that you endorsed: We liberated Kuwait.

Soon after, the Arab world and Israel sat down to talk seriously, and comprehensively, about peace—an historic first. And soon after that, at Christmas, the last American hostages came home. Our policies were vindicated.

Much good can come from the prudent use of power. And much good can come of this: A world once divided into two armed camps now recognizes one sole and pre-eminent power: the United States of America.

And they regard this with no dread. For the world trusts us with power—and the world is right. They trust us to be fair, and restrained, they trust us to be on the side of decency. They trust us to do what's right.

And I use those words advisedly. A few days after the war began I received a telegram from Joanne Speicher, the wife of the first pilot killed in the Gulf, Lt. Commander Scott Speicher. Even in her grief she wanted me to know that some day, when her children were old enough, she would tell them "* * * that their father went away to war because it was the right thing to do."

She said it all. It was the right thing to do.

And we did it together. There were honest differences right here, in this Chamber. But when the war began, you put partisanship aside, and supported our troops.

This is still a time for pride—but this is no time to boast. For problems face us, and we must stand together once again and solve them—and not let our country down.

Two years ago I began planning cuts in military spending that reflected the changes of the new era. But now, this year, with imperial communism gone, that process can be accelerated.

Tonight I can tell you of dramatic changes in our strategic nuclear force. These are actions we are taking on our own—because they are the right thing to do.

After completing 20 planes for which we have begun procurement, we will shut down further production of the B-2 bomber. We will cancel the small I.C.B.M. program. We will cease production of new warheads for our sea-based ballistic missiles. We will stop all new production of the Peacekeeper missile. And we will not purchase any more advanced cruise missiles.

This weekend I will meet at Camp David with Boris Yeltsin of the Russian Federation. I have informed President Yeltsin that if the Commonwealth—the former Soviet Union—will eliminate all land-based multiple warhead ballistic missiles, I will do the following:

We will eliminate all Peacekeeper missiles. We will reduce the number of warheads on Minuteman missiles to one, and reduce the number of warheads on our sea-based missiles by about one-third. And we will convert a substantial portion of our strategic bombers to primarily conventional use.

President Yeltsin's early response has been very positive, and I expect our talks at Camp David to be fruitful.

I want you to know that for half a century, American presidents have longed to make such decisions and say such words. But even in the midst of celebration, we must keep caution as a friend.

For the world is still a dangerous place. Only the dead have seen the end of conflict. And though yesterday's challenges are behind us, tomorrow's are being born.

The Secretary of Defense recommended these cuts after consultation with the Joint Chiefs of Staff. And I make them with confidence. But do not misunderstand me:

The reductions I have approved will save us an additional 50 billion dollars over the next five years. By 1997 we will have cut defense by 30 percent since I took office. These cuts are deep, and you must know my resolve: This deep, and no deeper.

To do less would be insensible to progress—but to do more would be ignorant of history.

We must not go back to the days of "the hollow army". We cannot repeat the mistakes made twice in this century, when armistice was followed by recklessness, and defense was purged as if the world were permanently safe.

I remind you this evening that I have asked for your support in funding a program to protect our country from limited nuclear missile attack. We must have this protection because too many people in too many countries have access to nuclear arms, and I urge you again to pass the Strategic Defense Initiative, SDI.

There are those who say that now we can turn away from the world, that we have no special role, no special place.

But we are the United States of America, the leader of the west that has become the leader of the world, and as long as I am President I will continue to lead in support of freedom everywhere—not out of arrogance, not out of altruism, but for the safety and security of our children.

This is a fact: Strength in the pursuit of peace is no vice; isolationism in the pursuit of security is no virtue. Now to our troubles at home. They are not all economic, but the primary problem is our economy. There are some good signs: Inflation, that thief, is down; and interest rates are down. But unemployment is too high, some industries are in trouble, and growth is not what it should be.

Let me tell you right from the start and right from the heart: I know we're in hard times, but I know something else: This will not stand.

My friends in this Chamber: We can bring the same courage and sense of common purpose to the economy that we brought to Desert Storm. And we can defeat hard times together.

I believe you will help. One reason is that you're patriots, and you want the best for your country. And I believe that in your hearts you want to put partisanship aside and get the job done—because it's the right thing to do.

The power of America rests in a stirring but simple idea: That people will do great things if only you set them free.

Well, we're going to set the economy free, for if this age of miracles and wonders has taught us anything, it's that if we can change the world, we can change America.

We must encourage investment. We must make it easier for people to invest money and create new products, new industries, and new jobs. We must clear away the obstacles to growth—high taxes, high regulation, red tape, and yes, wasteful government spending.

None of this will happen with a snap of the fingers—but it will happen. And the test of a plan isn't whether it's called new or dazzling. The American people aren't impressed by gimmicks; they're smarter on this score than all of us in this room. The only test of a plan is: Is it sound and will it work?

We must have a short term plan to address our immediate needs, and heat up the economy.

And then we need a longer term plan to keep the combustion going, and to guarantee our place in the world economy.

There are certain things that a President can do without Congress—And I am going to do them.

I have this evening asked major cabinet departments and federal agencies to institute a 90-day moratorium on any new federal regulations that could hinder growth. In those 90 days major departments and agencies will carry out a top to bottom review of all regulations, old and new—to stop the ones that will hurt growth, and speed up those that will help growth.

Further, for the untold number of hard working, responsible American workers and businessmen and women, who've been forced to go without needed bank loans: The banking credit crunch must end. I won't neglect my responsibility for sound regulations that serve the public good, but regulatory overkill must be stopped.

And I have instructed our government regulators to stop it.

I have directed cabinet departments, and federal agencies, to speed up progrowth expenditures as quickly as possible. This should put an extra 10 billion dollars into the economy in the next 6 months. And our new transportation bill provides more than 150 billion dollars for construction and maintenance projects that are vital to our growth and well being. That means jobs building roads, jobs building bridges, and jobs building railways.

I have this evening directed the Secretary of the Treasury to change the federal tax withholding tables. With this change, millions of Americans from whom the government withholds more than necessary can now choose to have the government withhold less from their paychecks. Something tells me a number of taxpayers may take us up on this one.

This initiative could return about 25 billion dollars back into our economy over the next 12 months—money people can use to help pay for clothing, college, or to get a new car.

Finally, working with the Federal Reserve, we will continue to support monetary policy that keeps both interest rates and inflation down.

Now, these are the things I can do. And now, members of Congress, let me tell you what you can do for your country. You must pass the other elements of my plan to meet our economic needs.

Everyone knows that investment spurs recovery.

I am proposing this evening a change in the alternative minimum tax, and the creation of a new 15 percent investment tax allowance. This will encourage businesses to accelerate investment and bring people back to work.

Real estate has led our economy out of almost all the tough times we've ever had. Once building starts, carpenters and plumbers work and people buy homes and take out mortgages.

My plan would modify the Passive Loss Rule for active real estate developers. And it would make it easier for pension plans to purchase real estate.

For those Americans who dream of buying a first home, but who can't quite afford it, my plan would allow first time home buyers to withdraw savings from I.R.A.'s without penalty—and provide a five thousand dollar tax credit for the first purchase of that home.

And finally, my immediate plan calls on Congress to give crucial help to people who own a home, to everyone who has a business, or a farm, or a single investment.

This time, at this hour, I cannot take No for an answer: You must cut the capital gains tax on the people of our country.

Never has an issue been more demagogued by its opponents. But the demagogues are wrong, they are wrong, and they know it.

Sixty percent of the people who benefit from lower capital gains have incomes under 50 thousand dollars. A cut in the capital gains tax increases jobs and helps just about everyone in our country.

And so I am asking you to cut the capital gains tax to a maximum of 15.4 percent.

And I'll tell you, those of you who say, "Oh no, someone who's comfortable may benefit from that." You kind of remind me of the old definition of the Puritan, who couldn't sleep at night worrying that somehow someone somewhere was out having a good time.

The opponents of this measure—and those who've authored various so called soak-the-rich bills that are floating around this chamber—should be reminded of something: When they aim at the big guy they usually hit the little guy. And maybe it's time that stopped.

This then is my short term plan. Your part, Members of Congress, requires enactment of these common sense proposals that will have a strong effect on the economy—without breaking the budget agreement and without raising tax rates.

While my plan is being passed and kicking in, we've got to care for those in trouble today. I have provided up to 4.4 billion dollars in my budget to extend federal unemployment benefits. I ask for Congressional action right away, and I thank the committees.

And let's be frank. Let me level with you.

I know, and you know, that my plan is unveiled in a political season. I know, and you know, that everything I propose will be viewed by some in merely partisan terms. But I ask you to know what is in my heart: My aim is to increase our nation's good. I am doing what I think is right; I am proposing what I know will help.

I pride myself that I am a prudent man. I believe that patience is a virtue, but I understand that politics is, for some, a game—and that sometimes the game is to stop all progress and then decry the lack of improvement.

But let me tell you: far more important than my political future—and far more important than yours—is the well being of our country. Members of this Chamber are practical people, and I know you won't resent some practical advice: When people put their party's fortunes—whatever the party, whatever side of the aisle—before the public good, they court defeat not only for their country, but for themselves. And they will certainly deserve it.

I submit my plan tomorrow. I am asking you to pass it by March 20th. And I ask the American people to let you know they want this action by March 20th.

From the day after that, if it must be: the battle is joined.

And you know, when principle is at stake I relish a good fair fight.

I said my plan has two parts, and it does. And it is the second part that is the heart of the matter. For it's not enough to get an immediate burst—we need long term improvement in our economic position.

We all know that the key to our economic future is to ensure that America

continues as the economic leader of the world. We have that in our power.

Here, then, is my long term plan to guarantee our future.

First, trade: We will work to break down the walls that stop world trade. We will work to open markets everywhere.

In our major trade negotiations I will continue pushing to eliminate tariffs and subsidies that damage America's farmers and workers. And we'll get more good American jobs within our own hemisphere through the North American Free Trade Agreement, and through the Enterprise for the Americas Initiative.

But changes are here, and more are coming. The workplace of the future will demand more highly skilled workers than ever—more people who are computer literate, and highly educated.

We must be the world's leader in education. We must revolutionize America's schools.

My America 2000 strategy will help us reach that goal. My plan will give parents more choice, give teachers more flexibility, and help communities create New American Schools.

Thirty states across the nation have established America 2000 programs. Hundreds of cities and towns have joined in.

Now Congress must join this great movement: Pass my proposals for New American Schools.

That was my second long term proposal, and here is my third:

We must make common sense investments that will help us compete, long term, in the marketplace.

We must encourage research and development. My plan is to make the R and D tax credit permanent, and to provide record levels of support—over 76 billion dollars this year alone—for people who will explore the promise of emerging technologies.

Fourth, we must do something about crime, and drugs.

It is time for a major, renewed investment in fighting violent street crime. It saps our strength and hurts our faith in our society, and in our future together.

Surely a tired woman on her way to work at 6 in the morning on a subway deserves the right to get there safely. Surely it's true that everyone who changes his or her life because of crime—from those afraid to go out at night to those afraid to walk in the parks they pay for—surely these people have been denied a basic civil right.

It is time to restore it. Congress, pass my comprehensive crime bill. It is tough on criminals and supportive of police—and it has been languishing in these hallowed halls for years now.

Pass it. Help your country.

Fifth, I ask you tonight to fund our H.O.P.E. housing proposal—and to pass my Enterprise Zone legislation, which will get businesses into the inner city. We must empower the poor with the pride that comes from owning a home, getting a job, becoming a part of things.

My plan would encourage real estate construction by extending tax incentives for mortgage revenue bonds and low income housing.

And I ask tonight for record expenditures for the program that helps children born into want move into excellence: Head Start.

Step six—we must reform our health care system. For this too bears on whether or not we can compete in the world.

American health costs have been exploding. This year America will spend over 800 billion dollars on health. And that's expected to grow to 1.6 trillion by the end of the decade. We simply cannot afford this.

The cost of health care shows up not only in your family budget, but in the price of everything we buy and everything we sell. When health coverage for a fellow on an assembly line costs thousands of dollars, the cost goes into the products he makes—and you pay the bill.

We must make a choice.

Now, some pretend we can have it both ways. They call it Play or Pay—but that expensive approach is unstable. It will mean higher taxes, fewer jobs and, eventually, a system under complete government control.

Really, there are only two options: We can move toward a nationalized system—which will restrict patient choice in picking a doctor and force the government to ration services arbitrarily. And what we'll get is patients in long lines, indifferent service, and a huge new tax burden.

Or we can reform our own private health care system—which still gives us, for all its flaws, the best quality health care in the world.

Well, let's build on our strengths.

My plan provides insurance security for all Americans—while preserving and increasing the idea of choice. We make basic health insurance affordable for all low income people not now covered. We do it by providing a health insurance tax credit of up to $3,750 for each low income family. The middle class gets help too. And, by reforming the health insurance market, my plan assures that Americans will have access to basic health insurance even if they change jobs or develop serious health problems.

We must bring costs under control, preserve quality, preserve choice, and reduce the people's nagging daily worry about health insurance. My plan, the details of which I will announce very shortly, does just that.

Seventh, we must get the federal deficit under control.

We now have in law enforceable spending caps, a requirement that we pay for the programs we create.

There are those in Congress who would ease that discipline now. But I cannot let them do it—and I won't.

My plan would freeze all domestic discretionary budget authority—which means "No more next year than this year." I will not tamper with Social Security, but I would put real caps on the growth of uncontrolled spending. I would also freeze federal domestic government employment.

With the help of Congress, my plan will get rid of 246 programs that don't deserve federal funding. Some of them have noble titles, but none of them is indispensable. We can get rid of each and every one of them.

You know, it's time we rediscovered a "home truth" the American people have never forgotten: This government is too big and spends too much.

I call upon Congress to adopt a measure that will help put an end to the annual ritual of filling the budget with pork-barrel appropriations. Every year, the press has a field day making fun of outrageous examples—a Lawrence Welk museum, a research grant for Belgian Endive.

We all know how these things get into the budget. Maybe you need someone to help you say No. I know how to say it. And I know what I need to make it stick. Give me the same thing 43 Governors have: The line item veto, and let me help you control the spending.

We must put an end to unfinanced federal government mandates. These are the requirements Congress puts on our cities, counties and states—without supplying the money. If Congress passes a mandate, it should be forced to pay for it, and to balance the cost with savings elsewhere. After all, a mandate just increases someone else's burden—and that means higher taxes at the state and local level.

Step eight: Congress should enact the bold reform proposals that are still awaiting Congressional action—bank reform, civil justice reform, tort reform, and my national energy strategy.

Finally: We must strengthen the family—because it is the family that has the greatest bearing on our future. When Barbara holds an AIDS baby in her arms, and reads to children, she's saying to every person in this country "Family matters."

I am announcing tonight a new Commission on America's Urban Families.

I have asked Missouri's Governor John Ashcroft, to be Chairman, a former Dallas Mayor in Dallas, Annette Strauss, to be co-chair. You know, I had Mayors, leading Mayors from the League of Cities in the other day at the White House and they told me something striking. They said that every one of them, Republican or Democrat, agreed on one thing: That the major cause of the problems of the cities is the dissolution of the family.

They asked for this Commission, and they were right to ask, because it's

time to determine what we can do to keep families together, strong and sound.

There's one thing we can do right away: ease the burden of rearing a child. I ask you tonight to raise the personal exemption by five hundred dollars per child for every family. For a family with four kids, that's an increase of two thousand dollars. This is a good start, in the right direction, and it's what we can afford.

It's time to allow families to deduct the interest they pay on student loans. I am asking you to do just that. And I'm asking you to allow people to use money from their I.R.A.'s to pay medical and education expenses—all without penalties.

And I'm asking for more. Ask American parents what they dislike about how things are going in our country, and chances are good that pretty soon they'll get to welfare.

Americans are the most generous people on earth. But we have to go back to the insight of Franklin Roosevelt who, when he spoke of what became the welfare program, warned that is must not become "a narcotic" and a "subtle destroyer" of the spirit.

Welfare was never meant to be a lifestyle; it was never meant to be a habit; it was never supposed to be passed from generation to generation like a legacy.

It's time to replace the assumptions of the welfare state, and help reform the welfare system.

States throughout the country are beginning to operate with new assumptions: That when able-bodied people receive government assistance, they have responsibilities to the taxpayer. A responsibility to seek work, education, or job training—a responsibility to get their lives in order—a responsibility to hold their families together and refrain from having children out of wedlock—and a responsibility to obey the law.

We are going to help this movement. Often, state reform requires waiving certain federal regulations. I will act to make that process easier and quicker for every state that asks our help.

And I want to add, as we make these changes and work together to improve the system, that our intention isn't scapegoating or finger pointing. If you read the papers or watch TV you know there's been a rise these days in a certain kind of ugliness, racist comments, anti-semitism, an increased sense of division.

Really, this is not us. This is not who we are. And this is not acceptable.

And so you have my plan for America. I am asking for big things—but I believe in my heart you will do what's right.

You know, it's kind of an American tradition to show a certain skepticism toward our democratic institutions. I myself have sometimes thought the aging process could be delayed if it had to make its way through Congress.

You will deliberate, and you will discuss, and that is fine.

But, my friends: the people cannot wait. They need help now.

There is a mood among us. People are worried, there has been talk of decline. Someone even said our workers are lazy and uninspired.

And I thought, really. Go tell Neil Armstrong standing on the moon. Tell the men and women who put him there. Tell the American farmer who feeds his country and the world. Tell the men and women of Desert Storm.

Moods come and go, but greatness endures.

Ours does.

And maybe for a moment it's good to remember what, in the dailyness of our lives, we forget:

We are still and ever the freest Nation on Earth—the kindest Nation on Earth—the strongest Nation on Earth—

And we have always risen to the occasion.

We are going to lift this nation out of hard times inch by inch and day by day, and those who would stop us had better step aside. Because I look at hard times and I make this vow: This will not stand.

And so we move on, together, a rising nation, the once and future miracle that is still, this night, the hope of the world.

Thank you. God bless you. God bless our beloved country

[Applause, the Members rising.]

At 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m., the President of the United States, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Doorkeeper escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The Members of the President's Cabinet.

The Chief Justice of the United States and the Associate Justices of the Supreme Court.

The Ambassadors, Ministers, and Chargé d'Affaires of foreign governments.

JOINT SESSION DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOYER). The Chair declares the joint session of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly, at 10 o'clock p.m., the joint session of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE ON THE STATE OF THE UNION

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message of the President be referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

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. GOSS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DREIER of California, for 60 minutes each day, today and on January 29.

Mr. DELAY, for 60 minutes each day, today and on January 29 and February 4, 5, and 6.

Mrs. BENTLEY, for 60 minutes each day, today and on January 29 and 30, February 4, 5, 6, 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, and 27.

Mr. GALLEGLY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN of California, for 5 minutes each day, today and on February 4, 5, 6, 18, 19, 20, 25, 26, and 27.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STOKES, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PANETTA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MONTGOMERY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BONIOR, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BRUCE, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. GEPHARDT, for 60 minutes each day, on March 4, 5, 11, 12, 24, 25, 31 and April 1, 8, 9, 15, 22, 29, and 30.

Mr. BRUCE, for 60 minutes each day, on January 29 and 30.

Mr. TORRES, for 60 minutes each day, on February 25, 26 and March 10, 11, 17, 18, 24, 25, 31 and April 7, 8, 28, and 29.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes each day, on January 29, 30, February 3, 6, and 7.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes each day, on January 29 and 30, February 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, March 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, and 31.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. VISCLOSKY) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. PELOSI, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GOSS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MICHEL.

Mr. PURSELL in three instances.

Mr. GALLO.

Mr. GALLEGLY in three instances.

Mr. MACHTLEY in six instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD in four instances.
Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.
Mr. PACKARD in three instances.
Mr. HORTON.
Mrs. BENTLEY.
Mr. OXLEY.
Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. PALLONE.
Mr. TORRES.
Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.
Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.
Mr. BROWN in 10 instances.
Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.
Mr. LANTOS in two instances.
Mr. ROE.
Mr. GLICKMAN.
Mr. CLEMENT.
Mr. MAZZOLI in six instances.
Mr. SLATTERY.
Mr. TRAXLER in three instances.
Ms. OAKAR.
Mr. DOWNEY.
Mr. TALLON.
Mr. SMITH of Florida.
Mr. CARDIN.
Mr. RAHALL in two instances.
Mr. KANJORSKI.
Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
Mr. MONTGOMERY.
Mr. MATSUI in two instances.
Mrs. BOXER.
Mr. LIPINSKI.
Mr. HERTEL.
Mr. SKELTON.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 36. An act entitled the "New York City Zebra Mussel Monitoring Act of 1991"; to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

S. 2131. An act to repeal section 618 of the Resolution Trust Corporation, Refinancing, Restructuring and Improvement Act of 1991; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 43. Concurrent resolution concerning the emancipation of the Baha'i community of Iran; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCURDY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 29, 1992, at 2 p.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2530. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting the CBO's Final Sequestration Report for Fiscal Year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-587); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2531. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting DOD's audit of merged and surplus accounts; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2532. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal the requirement to convert chromium and manganese ores held in the National Defense Stockpile into high carbon ferrochromium and high carbon ferromanganese; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2533. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Defense, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 37 and title 10, United States Code, to prohibit transporters from asserting liens on personal property of members of the Armed Forces while it is being transported at Government expense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2534. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting notification relating to an extension of a contract; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2535. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the biennial President's Report on National Urban Policy, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4503(a); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2536. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's ninth annual report on the Congregate Housing Services Program covering fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 8007(b); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2537. A letter from the President, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement, pursuant to section 2(b)(3) of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, with respect to a transaction involving a medium-term financial guarantee to support United States exports to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2538. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-122, "District of Columbia World Cup Soccer Ticket Sales Promotional Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2539. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-121, "Medicaid Spousal Maintenance Needs Allowance Increase Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2540. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-120, "Use of Consumer Identification Information Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2541. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-119, "Hugh A. Johnson, Jr., Park Designation Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2542. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-116, "Redistricting Procedure Amendment Act of 1991 Clarification and Free Clinic Assistance Program Act of 1986 Extension Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2543. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-125, "Merchant's Assistance Program Temporary Amendment Act of 1991," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2544. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-126, "District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 Temporary Amendment Act of 1991," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2545. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-123, "District of Columbia Real Property Credit Line Deed of Trust Clarification Amendment Act of 1991," and report pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2546. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-124, "Merchant's Civil Recovery for Criminal Conduct Temporary Act of 1991," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2547. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-117, "Closing of a Public Alley in Square N-6120, S.O. 88-339, Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2548. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-118, "Health-Care Decisions Amendment Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2549. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 9-127, "Voter Roll Maintenance Act of 1991," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2550. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Audit of the District Government's Contributions to the Morris Fitzgerald Memorial Tennis Stadium," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 47-117(d); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2551. A letter from the Commissioner for Rehabilitation Services, Department of Education, transmitting the annual report of the Rehabilitation Services Administration on Federal activities related to the administration of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 712; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2552. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—Student Assistance General Provisions, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2553. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting final regulations—State System for Transition Services for Youth With Disabilities, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2554. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of final regulations—Federal, State, and Local Partnership for Educational Improvement, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2555. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission for Employment Policy, transmitting three reports related to the effectiveness of the Employment Service in serving dislocated workers, pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1662c; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2556. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission for Employment Policy, transmitting a copy of a report entitled, "Coordinating Federal Assistance Programs for the Economically Disadvantaged: Recommendations and Background Materials," pursuant to 29 U.S.C. 1775; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2557. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission for Employment Policy, transmitting its report on the JTPA Education-Coordination Set-Aside Program; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2558. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual Horse Protection Enforcement Report for fiscal year 1990, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1830; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2559. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the biennial report of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry covering the period from January 1, 1989, through December 31, 1990, pursuant to Public Law 99-499, section 110(10) (100 Stat. 1641); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2560. A letter from the Chairperson, Advisory Panel on Alzheimer's Disease, transmitting its third annual report, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 679; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2561. A letter from the Chairman, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting its report on the results of their study of the feasibility of a user fee from entities subject to the Consumer Product Safety Act, pursuant to Public Law 101-608, section 119 (104 Stat. 3122); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2562. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting notification of the designation of an additional candidate site for the expansion of the Strategic Petroleum Reserve; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2563. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's report on Government dam use; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2564. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 1991 annual report on the current practices and methods of cigarette advertising and promotion, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1337(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2565. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the 1991 annual report on the current practices and methods of cigarette advertising and promotion, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 1337(b); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2566. A letter from the Secretary, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting notification that the Commission has extended the time period for issuing a final decision in Docket No. 40365, National Starch & Chemical Corp. versus The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co. et al., by 91 days to April 6, 1992, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 11345(e); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2567. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the fourth "Annual Report to Congress—NASA Progress on Superfund Implementation in Fiscal Year 1991," pursuant to Public Law 99-499, section 120(e)(5) (100 Stat. 1669); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2568. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the Drug Abuse Treatment Waiting List/Period Reduction Grant Program, pursuant to Public Law 101-374, section 2(d); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2569. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the Private Sector Revolving Fund's annual report for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2151f(h); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2570. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 01-92, concerning a proposed Memorandum of Understanding Cooperative Project with the Ministers of Defense of Spain and Italy, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2571. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting notification of the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance [LOA] to Thailand for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 92-14), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2572. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Presidential Determination No. 92-9 relating to assistance to Yugoslavia and a justification for the determination, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2601(c)(3); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2573. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the price and availability report for the quarter ending December 31, 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2768; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2574. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the activities of U.S.-U.S.S.R. Standing Consultative Commission during calendar year 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2578; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2575. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, a report on the status of efforts to obtain compliance by Iraq with the resolutions adopted by the United Nations Security Council, pursuant to Public Law 102-1, section 3 (105 Stat. 4) (H. Doc. No. 102-179); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2576. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Personnel Support, Families and Education), transmitting a report on the audit of the American Red Cross for the year ending June 30, 1991, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 6; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2577. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2578. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2579. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting notification to continue the support for the activities of PVO's in Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2580. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that the President intends to exercise his authority under section 614(a)(1) of the Foreign Assistance Act providing startup funding to the OAS civilian mission to Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2581. A letter from the Executive Director, Japan-United States Friendship Commission, transmitting the Commission's annual report for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2904(b); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2582. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the 1992 Annual Foreign Policy Report to Congress (January 21, 1992 to January 20, 1993); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2583. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB estimate of the amount of change in outlays or receipts, as the case may be, in each fiscal year through fiscal year 1995 resulting from passage of H.R. 1776 and S. 543, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-582); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2584. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting its second annual report on civil monetary penalty assessments, collections, and status of receivables for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to Public Law 101-410, section 6 (104 Stat. 892); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2585. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Department's Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991 and management report, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2586. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2587. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a report concerning surplus Federal real property disposed of to educational institutions in fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 484(o)(1); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2588. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991 and management report, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2589. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991 and management report, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2590. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the U.S. Government Annual Report for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 331(c); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2591. A letter from the Director, ACTION, transmitting copies of new or altered systems of records, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(r); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2592. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting the actuarial reports on the Judicial Retirement System, the Judicial Officer's Re-

tirement Fund, and the Judicial Survivors' Annuities System for the calendar year ending December 31, 1990, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2593. A letter from the Secretary, American Battle Monuments Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2594. A letter from the Appalachian Regional Commission, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general covering the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2595. A letter from the Director, ACTION Agency, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2596. A letter from the Chief of Staff, U.S. Nuclear Waste Negotiator, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2597. A letter from the Chairman, Commission on Agriculture Workers, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2598. A letter from the Chairman, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2599. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office, transmitting the report on unauthorized appropriations and expiring authorizations, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 602(f)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2600. A letter from the Consumer Safety Product Commission, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the inspector general covering the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2601. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2602. A letter from the Bureau of Naval Personnel, Department of the Navy, transmitting the 1990 annual report for the Navy Nonappropriated Fund Retirement Plan of employees of Civilian Morale, Welfare and Recreation, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2603. A letter from the Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2604. A letter from the Deputy Assistant to the President for Management and Director of Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2605. A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2606. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General covering the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2607. A letter from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 8E(h)(2) (102 Stat. 2525); to the Committee on Governmental Operations.

2608. A letter from the President, export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2609. A letter from the Chairman, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2610. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2611. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2612. A letter from the Director, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2613. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2614. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2615. A letter from the Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2616. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2617. A letter from the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general covering the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2618. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2619. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a report entitled "1991 budget Estimates: What Went Wrong" (GAO/OCG-92-1); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2620. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2621. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report covering the disposal of surplus Federal real property for historic monument, correctional facility, and airport purposes for fiscal year 1991; description of negotiated disposals of surplus real property having an estimated value of more than $15,000, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 484(o); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2622. A letter from the General Services Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on the activities of the Department's inspector general for the period April 1, 1991, through September 39, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section (b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2623. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2624. A letter from the Secretary, Mississippi River Commission, Corps of Engineers, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2625. A letter from the Acting Archivist, National Archives, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2626. A letter from the Chairman, National Commission on Responsibilities for Financing Postsecondary Education, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2627. A letter from the National Commission on Responsibilities for Financing Postsecondary Education, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general covering the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2628. A letter from the National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2629. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2630. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Humanities, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2631. A letter from the Chairman, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2632. A letter from the Chairman, National Mediation Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2633. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting notice of a revised Federal records system, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2634. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2635. A letter from the chairman, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2636. A letter from the Commissioner, Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2637. A letter from the Deputy Director, Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2638. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2639. A letter from the Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the semiannual report under the inspector general for the period of April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2640. A letter from the President, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Manager's Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2641. A letter from the Chairman, Oversight Board of the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting its annual report on the status of its audit and investigative coverage; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2642. A letter from the Administrator, Panama Canal Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2643. A letter from the Panama Canal Commission, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general covering the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2644. A letter from the Director, Peace Corps, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2645. A letter from the Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2646. A letter from the Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general covering the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2647. A letter from the Secretary of Treasury, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2648. A letter from the Secretary of Treasury, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2515, 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2649. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2650. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2651. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (96 Stat. 750, 102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2652. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2653. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2654. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2655. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2656. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation covering the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2657. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2658. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2659. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general covering the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, and management report, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2660. A letter from the Director, Selective Service, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2661. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report of the inspector general for the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2662. A letter from the U.S. Commissioner, Susquenanna River Basin Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2663. A letter from the Director, U.S. Information Agency, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2664. A letter from the Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Mangers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2665. A letter from the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2666. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2667. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2668. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2669. A letter from the President, U.S. Institute of Peace, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2670. A letter from the U.S. Institute of Peace, transmitting the semiannual report of activities of the inspector general cover-

ing the period April 1, 1991 through September 30, 1991, pursuant to Public Law 95-452, section 5(b) (102 Stat. 2526); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2671. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Cultural and Trade Center Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2672. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2673. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Merit Systems Protection Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2674. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2675. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Postal Service Board of Governors, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1991, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2676. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2677. A letter from the Director, U.S. Trade and Development Program, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2678. A letter from the Director, U.S. Soldiers' and Airmen's Home, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2679. A letter from the Director of Financial Services, Library of Congress, transmitting a balance sheet, statement of income and expenditures, and supporting schedules of transactions for the Capitol Preservation Fund for Coins, Sales Surcharges, and Gift and Sales of Art, Property, and Money for the period of April 1, 1991 through December 31, 1991; to the Committee on House Administration.

2680. A letter from the Clerk of the House, transmitting a list of reports pursuant to clause 2, rule III of the Rules of the House of Representatives, pursuant to rule III, clause 2, of the Rules of the House (H. Doc. No. 102-180); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

2681. 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.

2682. 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.

2683. 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.

2684. 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.

2685. 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.

2686. 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.

2687. A letter from the Acting Deputy Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Helium Act Amendments of 1960 to authorize Federal agencies to purchase helium from the private sector, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2688. 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.

2689. A letter from the Chairman, National Indian Gaming Commission, transmitting its 1991 annual report, pursuant to Public Law 100-497, section 7(c) (102 Stat. 2471); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2690. A letter from the Inspector General, Department of the Interior, transmitting a copy of a final audit report entitled "Accounting for Fiscal Year 1989 and 1990 Reimbursable Expenditures of Environmental Protection Agency Superfund Money, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service," Report No. 92-I-262, dated December 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 7501 note; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2691. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 1992 update to the national plan for research in mining and mineral resources and the 1992 report on the Mineral Institute Program of the U.S. Department of the Interior, pursuant to 30 U.S.C. 1229(e); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

2692. A letter from the Staff Director, U.S. Sentencing Commission, transmitting a report entitled, "The Federal Sentencing Guidelines: A Report on the Operation of the Guidelines System and Short-Term Impacts on Disparity in Sentencing, Use of Incarceration, and Prosecutorial Discretion and Plea Bargaining," pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 994 note; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2693. A letter from the Chairman, Copyright Royalty Tribunal, transmitting its annual report for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1991, pursuant to 17 U.S.C. 808; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2694. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on the State Legalization Impact Assistance Grant Program for fiscal year 1989, pursuant to Public Law 99-603, section 204; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2695. A letter from the Clerk, Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting a letter relating to amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2696. A letter from the Clerk, U.S. Claims Court, transmitting the court's report for the year ended September 30, 1991, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 791(c); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2697. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his determination that sanctions will not be imposed against Venezuela and Vanuata at this time, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1978(b) (H. Doc. No. 102-182); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

2698. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his determination that sanctions will not be imposed against Costa Rica, France, Italy, Japan, and Panama at this time, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 1978(b) (H. Doc. No. 102-183); to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ordered to be printed.

2699. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a plan for licensing operators of uninspected Federally documented commercial fishing industry vessels, pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 7101 note; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2700. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize reimbursement of travel and subsistence examinations of foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2701. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to rename the Klamath Forest National Wildlife Refuge; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2702. A letter from the Chairman, Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, transmitting the annual report of activities for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1991, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 715b; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

2703. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a report evaluating the need to extend interim geographic adjustments to Federal General Schedule employees in additional geographic areas; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

2704. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report on discharges of minimum pollutants into navigable waters, pursuant to Public Law 100-4, section 516(b) (101 Stat. 86); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2705. A letter from the General Counsel of the Department of Transportation, transmitting an amendment to the lease of the metropolitan Washington airports between the United States acting by and through the Secretary of Transportation and the Metropolitan Washington Airports Authority; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2706. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting an informational copy of a lease prospectus, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2707. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Conservation and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting notifica-

tion that the report on the Automotive Technology Development Program should be ready for submission by the end of the year, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5914; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2708. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the 1991 annual report on the performance of its industrial application centers and on the ability to interact with the Nation's small business community, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 648(f); to the Committee on Small Business.

2709. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the final monthly Treasury statement of receipts and outlays of the U.S. Government for fiscal year 1991, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 331(c); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2710. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting OMB's final sequestration report to the President and Congress for fiscal year 1992, pursuant to Public Law 101-508, section 13101(a) (104 Stat. 1388-587) (H. Doc. No. 102-181); to the Committee on the State of the Union of the Whole House and ordered to be printed.

2711. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on the study of reimbursement policies for clinical diagnostic laboratory travel allowance and specimen collection, pursuant to Public Law 100-647, section 8421; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and means and Energy and Commerce.

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. JONES of North Carolina: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Concurrent Resolution 229. Resolution to insure that full restitution and reimbursement is made to the United States Coast Guard for its costs in the response to the oilspill in the Arabian Gulf; and to instruct the United Nations to earmark a percentage of the moneys collected for the United Nations Compensation Fund toward Arabian Gulf oilspill and Kuwaiti oil well spill cleanup and environmental restoration; with an amendment (Rept. 102-425, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. CLAY: Committee on Post Office and Civil Services. H.R. 3209. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure that the level of compensation for a Federal employee ordered to military duty during the Persian Gulf conflict is not less than the level of civilian pay last received; to allow Federal employees to make up any Thrift Savings contributions forgone during military service; to preserve the recertification rights of senior executives ordered to military duty; and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 102-426). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Introduced January 3, 1992 and referred January 28, 1992]

By Mr. CONDIT:

H.R. 4086. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to restore the deduction for interest on indebtedness incurred to acquire a new American-made automobile; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota:

H.R. 4087. A bill to authorize the adjustment of the boundaries of the South Dakota portion of the Sioux Ranger District of Custer National Forest, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY:

H.R. 4088. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to establish a program with respect to concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged veterans; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER:

H.R. 4089. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make permanent the provisions permitting tax-exempt treatment for certain qualified small issue bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 4090. A bill to require that Government-held information pertaining to the assassination of John F. Kennedy be made available to the general public; jointly, to the Committees on Government Operations, House Administration, and the Judiciary.

H.R. 4091. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to provide protections to pensions and other employee benefits in bankruptcy cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 4092. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a credit against income tax for State sales taxes and interest paid in connection with the purchase of a new American-made passenger vehicle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.J. Res. 388. Joint resolution designating the month of May 1992 as "National Foster Care Month"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. HORTON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LENT, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. MINK, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. SCHAEFER, Ms. HORN, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. KOSTMAYER):

H.J. Res. 389. Joint resolution to designate February 6, 1992, as "National Women in Sports Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. SWETT):

H. Con. Res. 264. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the president should recognize the independence of the Republic of Kosova and extend full United States diplomatic recognition; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PENNY:

H. Res. 323. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the United States should take steps to reduce worldwide military expenditures, to reduce international arms transfers, and to stop the spread of weapons of mass destruction in order to promote peace and security and to ensure that more funds are available for social programs and economic development; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H. Res. 324. Resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to investigate the conduct of the Department of Justice in the case of John Demjanjuk, Sr.; to the Committee on Rules.

[Introduced January 22, 1992 and referred January 28, 1992]

By Mr. BUNNING (for himself and Mr. EMERSON):

H.R. 4093. A bill to amend the Food, Agriculture, Conservation, and Trade Act of 1990 to provide that a single Federal agency shall be responsible for making technical determinations with respect to wetland or converted wetland on agricultural lands; jointly, to the Committees on Agriculture and Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. GILMAN:

H.R. 4094. A bill to establish a schedule of preventive health care services and to provide for coverage of such services in accordance with such schedule under the Medicare Program, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program, and the health programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Ways and Means, Veterans' Affairs, and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI (for himself, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. PICKLE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. STARK, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. OBEY, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. WISE, and Mr. BORSKI):

H.R. 4095. A bill to increase the number of weeks for which benefits are payable under the Emergency Unemployment Compensation Act of 1991, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H.R. 4096. A bill to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, to increase the maximum amount in controversy permitted for cases under the jurisdiction of the Small Claims and Conciliation Branch of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia, and to authorize the Corporation Counsel for the District of Columbia to conduct criminal prosecutions of certain juvenile defendants; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GREEN of New York (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. MCGRATH):

H.R. 4097. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 with respect to the treatment of cooperative housing corporations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 4098. A bill regarding the importation of Japanese motor vehicles into the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARLENEE (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 4099. A bill to minimize the impact of Federal acquisition of private lands on units of local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GEPHARDT (for himself, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CARR, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. HALL of

Ohio, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. NOWAK, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. MOODY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. KLECZKA, Mrs. PATTERSON, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 4100. A bill to assure mutually advantageous international trade in motor vehicle and motor vehicle parts, an enhanced market for the interstate sale and export of domestically produced motor vehicles and motor vehicle parts, and the retention and enhancement of U.S. jobs; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. PASTOR:

H.R. 4101. A bill to expand the boundaries of the Saguaro National Monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RAMSTAD:

H.R. 4102. A bill to extend until January 1, 1995, the existing suspension on certain plastic web sheeting, and to correct the description of such sheeting; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SLATTERY:

H.R. 4103. A bill to ensure adequate disclosure of information regarding yields of mutual funds; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of California (for himself, Mr. MICHEL, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. CRANE, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. GOSS, Mr. KYL, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. RIDGE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. UPTON, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H.R. 4104. A bill to prohibit Members of the House of Representatives from making franked mass mailings outside their congressional districts and to prohibit payment from official allowances for mass mailings by Members of the House of Representatives outside their congressional districts; jointly, to the Committees on Post Office and Civil Service and House Administration.

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. FEIGHAN, and Mr. PORTER):

H.J. Res. 390. Joint resolution designating March 25, 1992, as "Greek Independence Day: A National Day of Celebration of Greek and American Democracy;" to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota (for himself, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. CRANE, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. CAMPBELL of Colorado, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. OLIN, Mr. PENNY, and Mr. RUSSO):

H. Con. Res. 265. Concurrent resolution urging the President to seek agreement with the European Community regarding a 1-year suspension of operation of the grain export subsidy programs of the United States and the Community; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs and Ways and Means.

[Introduced January 24, 1992 and referred January 28, 1992]

By Mr. CONDIT:

H.R. 4106. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for adoption expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself and Mr. GIBBONS):

H.R. 4107. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the treatment under section 936 of such Code to income from investments in Caribbean Basin and certain other countries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4108. A bill to direct the Archivist of the United States to make available for public use the records of the Warren Commission; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. GLICKMAN:

H.R. 4109. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase to 6 years the maximum required period of continuation coverage under an employer-provided group health plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HUCKABY:

H.R. 4110. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax relief for middle-income taxpayers and to encourage investment in businesses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFALCE:

H.R. 4111. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide additional loan assistance to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. MARLENEE:

H.R. 4112. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the use of Armed Forces insignia on State motor vehicle license plates issued to members of the Armed Forces and veterans; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ORTIZ:

H.R. 4113. A bill to permit the transfer before the expiration of the otherwise applicable 60-day congressional review period of the obsolete training aircraft carrier U.S.S. *Lexington* to the city of Corpus Christi, TX, for use as a naval museum and memorial; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCHUMER:

H.R. 4114. A bill to amend title 11 of the United States Code to permit governmental entities that hold certain interests with respect to pension benefits payable by the debtor to be appointed to creditors' and equity security holders' committees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 4115. A bill to encourage States to provide partial unemployment benefits to individuals whose workweeks have been reduced under employer plans providing for shortened workweeks in lieu of layoffs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SWIFT:

H.R. 4116. A bill to authorize appropriations for the Federal Election Commission for fiscal year 1993; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GONZALEZ (for himself and Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER):

H. Res. 325. Resolution to provide for the release for public use of records of the former Select Committee on Assassinations; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H. Res. 326. Resolution requiring that the records of the Select Committee on Assassinations of the 94th and 95th Congresses be made available for public use; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Mr. BROOMFIELD, and Mr. HASTERT):

H. Res. 327. Resolution calling for the immediate release of all hostages still held in Lebanon, and welcoming home all American hostages released from Lebanon; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. YATRON (for himself and Mr. FASCELL):

H. Con. Res. 266. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to United States participation in the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development [UNCED]; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

[Introduced January 28, 1992 and referred January 28, 1992]

By Mr. HOYER:

H.R. 4118. A bill to clarify that the provisions of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Improvement Act of 1991 relating to the continuation of health care benefits for employees of failed banks and thrift institutions are applicable to the Resolution Trust Corporation; to the Committee on Banking, Finance, and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. BENNETT (for himself and Mr. JAMES):

H.R. 4119. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a highway construction project to replace or repair the Fuller Warren Bridge in Jacksonville, FL; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

By Mr. BRYANT:

H.R. 4120. A bill to reduce the financial contributions of the United States to the defense of member nations of NATO (other than the United States) and Japan and to use amounts available because of those reductions to support law enforcement and education efforts in the United States; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, Education and Labor, and Appropriations.

By Mr. GALLEGLY (for himself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO).

H.R. 4121. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to encourage investments in new manufacturing and other productive equipment by providing a temporary investment tax credit to taxpayers who increase the amount of such investments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAYES of Illinois (for himself, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. DYMALLY, Mr. MFUME, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. UNSOELD, Ms. WATERS, and Mr. WHEAT):

H.R. 4122. A bill to guarantee a work opportunity for all Americans and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HORTON (for himself, Mr. PENNY, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. ZELIFF):

H.R. 4123. A bill to establish a 2-year pilot program requiring performance standards and goals for expenditures in certain Federal Government programs to be included in the Federal budget, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 4124. A bill to amend the Poultry Products Inspection Act to require the slaughter of poultry and the processing of poultry products in accordance with humane methods; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KOPETSKI:

H.R. 4125. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a variable capital gains deduction, and to provide for a carryover basis of property acquired from a decedent; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H.R. 4126. A bill to require the Western Area Power Administration to amend all long-term power service contracts to include provisions requiring the implementation of integrated resource planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PACKARD (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 4127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow home buyers to make tax-free withdrawals from individual retirement accounts and certain other retirement plans for the purpose of acquiring a principal residence; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REGULA:

H.R. 4128. A bill to distribute a portion of the Outer Continental Shelf natural gas and oil receipts to coastal States and coastal counties as impact assistance, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Interior and Insular Affairs and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mrs. ROUKEMA:

H.R. 4129. A bill to amend section 1012 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Amendments Act of 1988 to authorize local governments that have financed a housing project that has been provided a financial adjustment factor under section 8 of the U.S. Housing Act of 1937 to use 50 percent of any recaptured amounts available from refinancing of the project for housing activities; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SANTORUM (for himself Mr. KASICH, Mr. DELAY, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. WEBER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut):

H.R. 4130. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for contributions to a medical savings account, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SARPALIUS:

H.R. 4131. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for interest on any loan used to purchase a new American-made highway vehicle; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKAGGS:

H.R. 4132. A bill to extend until January 1, 1997, the existing suspension of duty on certain infant nursery intercoms and monitors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York (for herself, Mr. WYLIE, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. PRICE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. RHODES, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. DURBIN):

H.R. 4133. A bill to extend until April 1993 the demonstration project under which influenza vaccinations are provided to Medicare beneficiaries; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CUNNINGHAM (for himself, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 4134. A bill entitled, "The California-Mexico Border Drug Trafficking Reduction Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONNELLY (for himself and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts):

H.R. 4135. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a temporary investment tax credit for investments in certain productive equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. FROST, Mr. HORTON, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. EVANS, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NATCHER, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. ROGERS, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. MCEWEN, Mr. ESPY, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SMITH of Iowa, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WILSON, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. DE LA GARZA, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. GINGRICH):

H.J. Res. 391. Joint resolution to designate the week beginning on Sunday, August 16, 1992, as "National Convenience Store Appreciation Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. TALLON:

H.J. Res. 392. Joint resolution designating February 1-7, 1992, as "Travel Agent Appreciation Week"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Con. Res. 267. Concurrent resolution providing for a joint session of Congress to receive a message from the President on the State of the Union; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H. Con. Res. 268. Concurrent resolution to correct technical errors in the enrollment of the bill H.R.3866; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. DELLUMS:

H. Con. Res. 269. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the U.N. peace plan in the western Sahara; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HAYES of Illinois:

H. Con. Res. 270. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Federal Government should promote maximum employment, production, and purchasing power to protect and improve the quality of life in the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. TORRES:

H. Con. Res. 271. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the policy of mutual targeting of strategic nuclear weapons by the United States and the Commonwealth of Independent States no longer reflects the nonhostile relationship which exists between these political states, nor serves to further their strategic interests; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEPHARDT:

H. Res. 328. Resolution providing for a committee to notify the President of the assembly of the Congress; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. WHITTEN:

H. Res. 329. Resolution to inform the Senate that a quorum of the House has assembled; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. MOAKLEY:

H. Res. 330. Resolution providing for the hour of meeting of the House; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. BRUCE (for himself, Mr. DINGELL, and Ms. KAPTUR):

H. Res. 331. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the opening of Japanese markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUNDERSON (for himself, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. KYL, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. GOSS, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. ROTH, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. THOMAS of California):

H. Res. 332. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a recorded vote upon final passage of legislation that would make an appropriation or provide a direct spending authority or new credit authority; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RAHALL:

H. Res. 333. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the need for a program of loan guarantees for States and local government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

321. By the SPEAKER; Memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, relative to condominium homeowners of federally insured properties that have structural defects; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

322. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative of Ukraine's independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

323. Also, memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida, relative to Haiti; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

324. Also, memorial of the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, relative to Medicaid; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

[Introduced January 22, 1992 and referred January 28, 1992]

By Mr. LAFALCE;

H.R. 4105. A bill for the relief of Noco Energy Corp.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

[Introduced January 24, 1992 and referred January 28, 1992]

By Mr. FROST;

H.R. 4117. A bill for the relief of Maria Adriana Lopez; 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. 53: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BREWSTER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. HALL of Texas Mr. WHEAT, Mr. COX of California, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 64: Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 75: Mr. HAYES of Louisiana and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 78: Mr. WALKER.

H.R. 98: Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. MCCANDLESS, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY Mr. SAVAGE Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr.

JACOBS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FLAKE, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 106: Mr. LENT, Mr. RHODES, and Mr. HUBBARD.

H.R. 191: Mrs. LOWEY of New York.

H.R. 246: Mr. ALLARD, Mr. RIGGS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 251: Mr. NEAL of North Carolina and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 258: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 259: Mr. LEWIS of Florida and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 303: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SARPALIUS, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 304: Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 309: Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.R. 318: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 327: Mr. COX of Illinois.

H.R. 371: Mr. DURBIN, Mrs. BENTLEY, and Mr. GUARINI.

H.R. 384: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 415: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 423: Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 528: Ms. NORTON and Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 576: Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. MANTON, Mr. HATCHER, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 585: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 608: Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. ALEXANDER, and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 609: Mr. TOWNS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. KOLTER.

H.R. 642: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 643: Mr. SHARP.

H.R. 659: Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 668: Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 709: Mr. SCHUMER.

H.R. 710: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. ASPIN.

H.R. 722: Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. MARTIN.

H.R. 723: Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 786: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. AUCOIN, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 793: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MCDADE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. ERDREICH, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. STUDDS, and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 843: Mr. DOWNEY.

H.R. 875: Mr. MILLER of California and Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 888: Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. MOODY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. ECKART, and Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 916: Mr. WISE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. FASCELL.

H.R. 951: Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 962: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 967: Mr. BOUCHER and Mr. ROSE.

H.R. 978: Mr. BACCHUS.

H.R. 1004: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 1063: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. RICHARDSON.

H.R. 1110: Ms. HORN and Mr. HAYES of Illinois.

H.R. 1161: Mr. GUARINI and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1200: Mr. ANTHONY.

H.R. 1212: Mr. JAMES.

H.R. 1238: Mr. DURBIN.

H.R. 1240: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 1251: Mr. MANTON and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1252: Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 1253: Mr. MANTON and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1259: Mr. VISCLOSKY.

H.R. 1300: Mr. BROWN.

H.R. 1306: Mr. JACOBS, Mr. DOWNEY, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 1335: Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 1374: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 1389: Mr. PORTER and Mr. BLAZ.

H.R. 1396: Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 1398: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1414: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 1418: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 1423: Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 1473: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. HOUGHTON, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. REED, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1481: Mr. KOLTER and Mr. ROWLAND.

H.R. 1502: Mr. LEACH, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. ROE.

H.R. 1509: Mr. DIXON, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. EWING, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. THOMAS of Georgia, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. PARKER, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. GRANDY.

H.R. 1536: Mr. HOBSON, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 1541: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 1552: Mr. STUDDS.

H.R. 1565: Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H.R. 1566: Mrs. SCHROEDER.

H.R. 1598: Mr. WALSH, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DERRICK.

H.R. 1601: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 1602: Mr. TORRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1623: Mr. BLAZ, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 1624: Mr. BLAZ, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. BOEHLERT.

H.R. 1633: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. MAVROULES, and Mr. INHOFE.

H.R. 1653: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 1663: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. RHODES, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H.R. 1715: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1750: Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 1771: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. MORAN, Mr. SPENCE, and Mr. TANNER.

H.R. 1774: Mr. MCCLOSKEY and Mr. EDWARDS of California.

H.R. 1791: Mr. ATKINS.

H.R. 1820: Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. MCNULTY, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 1882: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. RAY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. YATES, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. KYL.

H.R. 1898: Mrs. BOXER, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. HERGER, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. STEARNS, and Mr. EMERSON.

H.R. 1956: Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1992: Mr. FISH, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2008: Mr. DORNAN of California and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 2029: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 2070: Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. ASPIN, Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. HUBBARD, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, and Mr. SKEEN.

H.R. 2082: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 2083: Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mrs. UNSOELD, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 2089: Mr. SWETT, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. CAMPBELL of California.

H.R. 2152: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. JACOBS.

H.R. 2197: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2248: Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. ESPY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 2309: Mr. DOOLEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2336: Mr. MARTIN.

H.R. 2363: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HASTERT, Ms. HORN, and Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2377: Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 2383: Mr. ENGEL and Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 2385: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FOGLIETTA, and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 2386: Mr. TORRES and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H.R. 2410: Mr. OWENS of Utah and Mr. LOWERY of California.

H.R. 2463: Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. LIVINGSTON, and Mr. HAYES of Louisiana.

H.R. 2486: Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 2535: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2540: Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. QUILLEN.

H.R. 2541: Mr. DOWNEY and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2553: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 2561: Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. KOLTER, MR. TORRICELLI, Mr. PASTOR, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2567: Mr. ENGLE.

H.R. 2580: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H.R. 2600: Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 2643: Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. FIELDS, Mr. DORNAN of California, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 2675: Mr. FEIGHAN.

H.R. 2755: Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2766: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. MCMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 2779: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2781: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2782: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. DYMALLY, and Mr. BLACKWELL.

H.R. 2815: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 2819: Mr. CLINGER, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. WISE, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. BRUCE, and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 2833: Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 2872: Mr. SUNDQUIST and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2880: Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. ROYBAL, MR. KOLTER, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SWETT, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2881: Mr. YATES.

H.R. 2884: Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 2890: Mr. ROGERS, Mr. BLAZ, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 2898: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CAMP, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 2912: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2945: Mr. CAMP and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 2964: Mr. HYDE, Mr. MCGRATH, and Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 2966: Mr. HUCKABY, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HANCOCK, Mr. KLUG, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 3011: Mr. ECKART, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. HEFLEY, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 3022: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 3026: Mr. PALLONE, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. ROYBAL, and Mr. PANETTA.

H.R. 3037: Mr. DICKINSON and Mr. COUGHLIN.

H.R. 3050: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3070: Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. ROGERS, and Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 3071: Mr. GALLO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. ESPY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. MCCURDY, Mr. WELDON, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. HOAGLAND, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 3082: Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. PAXON, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 3098: Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3124: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 3138: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. LENT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCGRATH, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 3146: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 3160: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. LUKEN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SIKORSKI, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3164: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. SCHAEFER, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. RITTER, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 3173: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 3185: Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3195: Mrs. UNSOELD and Mr. MINETA.

H.R. 3209: Mr. ESPY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. TRAXLER, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 3216: Mr. BARNARD, Mr. RITTER, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3221: Mr. PAXON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 3222: Mr. MFUME, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. MINK, Mr. KOLTER, MR. DICKINSON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. WEBER, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.R. 3231: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 3253: Mr. FASCELL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. BLACKWELL, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, and Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey.

H.R. 3312: Mr. DARDEN and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

H.R. 3317: Mr. FLAKE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BILBRAY, and Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 3349: Mr. GEREN of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. MARTIN.

H.R. 3360: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3373: Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. GORDON, Mr. RAY, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. POSHARD, Mr. PAYNE of Virginia, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. SABO, Mr. WALKER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. DAVIS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3393: Mr. MORAN.

H.R. 3417: Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 3423: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 3424: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.R. 3429: Mr. LIPINSKI and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 3438: Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 3439: Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 3440: Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 3442: Mr. BEILENSON.

H.R. 3454: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, and Mr. WOLPE.

H.R. 3471: Mr. GINGRICH.

H.R. 3475: Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLVER, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 3476: Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 3479: Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3513: Mr. THOMAS of California.

H.R. 3515: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FRANKS of Connecticut, and Mr. PETRI.

H.R. 3518: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3526: Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. STARK, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3537: Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 3542: Mr. ECKART.

H.R. 3544: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. TRAXLER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.R. 3545: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mr. SYNAR.

H.R. 3553: Mr. MINETA, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. CARR, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. SOLARZ, and Mr. MURTHA.

H.R. 3554: Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. ESPY.

H.R. 3555: Mr. SWETT and Mr. RIDGE.

H.R. 3557: Mr. KOPETSKI.

H.R. 3602: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. PICKETT, and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 3605: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 3612: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. REGULA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. KOSTMAYER.

H.R. 3613: Mr. YATES, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. WEISS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. ESPY, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 3620: Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.R. 3634: Mr. LAGOMARSINO.

H.R. 3636: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. PEASE, Mr. BRUCE, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. TORRICELLI

H.R. 3654: Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. ATKINS, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BEVILL, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DONNELLY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. EMERSON, Mr. ESPY, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FUSTER, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HAYES of Louisiana, Mr. JACOBS, MR. JEFFERSON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MFUME, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHARP, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. TALLON, Mr. THORNTON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. VALENTINE, Mr. WALSH, Mr. MORAN, Mr. FASCELL, Mr. FISH, Mr. GORDON, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. TOWNS.

H.R. 3655: Mr. SANGMEISTER and Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 3656: Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. SANGMEISTER, and Mr. DE LUGO.

H.R. 3677: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 3681: Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 3690: Mr. Applegate, Mr. SABO, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 3702: Mr. RUSSO, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 3705: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3740: Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HUBBARD, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3753: Ms. NORTON and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 3758: Mr. STARK, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. LEVINE of California.

H.R. 3782: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. MINETA, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. PRICE, Mr. STARK, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. WAXMAN, Mrs. UNSOELD, Mr. MOODY, Mr. WYDEN, Ms. DELAURO, and Ms. LONG.

H.R. 3783: Mr. DIXON, Mr. COX of Illinois, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. VANDER JAGT, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 3801: Mr. VALENTINE, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 3803: Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota.

H.R. 3808: Mr. ANDREWS of Maine, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. ZELIFF, Mr. HYDE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 3809: Mr. ZELIFF and Mr. LEHMAN of Florida.

H.R. 3816: Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. HORTON, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. ERDREICH, and Mr. BRUCE.

H.R. 3822: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 3832: Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MINK, and Mr. SCHEUER.

H.R. 3836: Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.R. 3841: Mr. SPENCE, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3844: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. PENNY, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. YATES.

H.R. 3846: Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 3848: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. RHODES.

H.R. 3864: Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. TALLON, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. DICKINSON.

H.R. 3871: Ms. MOLINARI, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. HORTON, Mr. WILSON, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. RITTER.

H.R. 3878: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 3886: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H.R. 3891: Mr. DORNAN of California and Mr. DANNEMEYER.

H.R. 3904: Ms. NORTON, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. OWENS of Utah, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3908: Mrs. LLOYD.

H.R. 3922: Mr. EVANS and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 3923: Mr. LAGOMARSINO and Mr. GALLO.

H.R. 3939: Ms. NORTON, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. VENTO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. YATES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BROWN, Mr. STARK, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAVENEL and Mr. HENRY.

H.R. 3943: Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. COYNE, Mr. HOAGLAND, and Mr. ERDREICH.

H.R. 3961: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3975: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. BROWN, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. SMITH of Florida.

H.R. 3994: Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. ANNUNZIO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MANTON, and Mr. MCGRATH.

H.R. 4002: Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. OWENS of Utah, Mr. BEILENSON, Mr. HORTON, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. RITTER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LEHMAN of Florida, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. EVANS, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOPETSKI, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. MANTON.

H.R. 4010: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 4013: Mr. BRUCE, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. VOLKMER, and Mr. GAYDOS.

H.R. 4025: Mr. BLAZ, Mr. HUCKABY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 4031: Mr. KOLBE.

H.R. 4032: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 4045: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. COYNE, and Mr. NEAL of North Carolina.

H.R. 4050: Mr. CAMP, Mr. HENRY, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. DAVIS.

H.R. 4051: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HORTON, and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.

H.R. 4077: Mr. SHARP and Mr. CHANDLER.

H.R. 4083: Mr. MOODY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. OBEY, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. WILSON.

H.R. 4095: Mr. WISE and Mr. BORSKI.

H.J. Res. 3: Mr. DICKINSON.

H.J. Res. 107: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. HEFNER, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. GUNDERSON.

H.J. Res. 159: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. VANDER JAGT.

H.J. Res. 237: Mr. HEFNER, Mr. GINGRICH, and Mr. DARDEN.

H.J. Res. 239: Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.J. Res. 293: Mr. RAY, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mrs. BYRON, and Mr. MRAZEK.

H.J. Res. 318: Mr. BENNETT, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. LIGHTFOOT, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. SABO, Mr. COUGHLIN, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DARDEN, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. COBLE, Mr. NATCHER, and Mr. BEVILL.

H.J. Res. 343: Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. AUCOIN, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BENNETT, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. COOPER, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. GINGRICH, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. JONES of Georgia, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LANCASTER, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MILLER of Ohio, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. REED, Mr. SABO, Mr. SANGMEISTER, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. WHITTEN, Mr. WOLF, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CARR, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. ROWLAND, Mr. HERTEL, and Mr. BRUCE.

H.J. Res. 357: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.J. Res. 358: Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. FAZIO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H.J. Res. 375: Mr. CONYERS and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H.J. Res. 378: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MINETA, Mr. HERTEL, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.J. Res. 388: Mr. ESPY, Mr. DOWNEY, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. MCMILLEN of Maryland, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. HUGHES, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. MORAN, and Mr. KOPETSKI.

H. Con. Res. 89: Mr. MANTON.

H. Con. Res. 160: Mr. ENGEL.

H. Con. Res. 180: Mr. SCHEUER.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mrs. LOWEY of New York, Mr. DICKINSON, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H. Con. Res. 210: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. TAUZIN.

H. Con. Res. 211: Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. EMERSON, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. WELDON.

H. Con. Res. 212: Mr. ECKART, Mr. FEIGHAN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. MCGRATH, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mrs. KENNELLY, Mr. CARDIN, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLO, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. PETERSON of Florida, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. DANNEMEYER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. OXLEY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. WELDON, Mr. CARPER, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. RUSSO, Mr. SWETT, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, and Mr. BORSKI.

H. Con. Res. 221: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CAMPBELL of California, and Mr. FAWELL.

H. Con. Res. 224: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. REGULA, Mr. HAYES of Illinois, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. STOKES, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SWETT, Mr. STALLINGS, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. OXLEY and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H. Con. Res. 227: Mr. SCHEUER.

H. Con. Res. 232: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. WAXMAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. FOGLIETTA.

H. Con. Res. 233; Mr. BROOMFIELD, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. DICKINSON, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SCHULZE, Mr. NEAL of North Carolina, Mr. ROE, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RINALDO, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H. Con. Res. 239; Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York, Mr. PORTER, Mr. WOLF, Mr. MARTINEZ, Ms. OAKAR, and Mr. LANTOS.

H. Con. Res. 245: Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. JONTZ.

H. Con. Res. 246: Mr. VENTO, Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota, Mr. SAVAGE, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Mrs. PATTERSON, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. BUSTAMANTE and Mr. GORDON.

H. Res. 180: Mr. TOWNS.

H. Res. 204: Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. ENGEL.

H. Res. 215: Mr. GOSS.

H. Res. 233: Mr. BREWSTER.

H. Res. 234: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. BATEMAN.

H. Res. 244: Mr. PAXON and Ms. SLAUGHTER of New York.

H. Res. 257: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H. Res. 271: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. KOPETSKI, and Mr. WYDEN.

H. Res. 297: Mr. UPTON.

H. Res. 302: Mr. GUARINI, Mr. KOLTER, Mrs. LLOYD, and Mr. LANCASTER.

H. Res. 311: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. GOSS.

H. Res. 314: Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. MCCLOSKEY.

H. Res. 315: Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H. Res. 322: Mr. COX of Illinois, Mr. BACCHUS, Mr. LAROCCO, Mr. GUARINI, Mr. APPLEGATE, Mr. HORTON, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, and Mr. WALSH.

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. 1330: Mr. STALLINGS.

H.R. 3769: Mr. BENNETT.

H. Res. 194: Mr. COSTELLO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

136. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Common Council of the city of Buffalo, relative to a ban on all cigarette advertising; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

137. Also, petition of Jerry Wiley, citizen of St. Paul, IN, relative to a bill of impeachment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

REGULATE THE MEDIUM, LIBERATE THE MESSAGE

HON. BOB TRAXLER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the following article "Regulate the Medium, Liberate the Message" by Lawrence K. Grossman, former president of NBC News and of the Public Broadcasting Service. This insightful article about media manipulation by business conglomerates appeared in the Columbia Journalism Review in the November/December 1991 issue.

REGULATE THE MEDIUM, LIBERATE THE MESSAGE

(By Lawrence K. Grossman)

Early in the morning of Tuesday, October 20, 1987, I received an angry phone call from Jack Welch, the hard-nosed chairman of GE, who had recently bought NBC. I was president of NBC News at the time and Welch was calling to complain about the way we were reporting the previous day's sudden stock market plunge. He thought our pieces were undercutting the public's confidence in the market, which would certainly not help the stock of NBC's new parent company. He felt no qualms about letting his news division know that he thought NBC's reporters should refrain from using depressing terms like "Black Monday" to describe what had happened to the stock market the day before. NBC reporters were never told about their chairman's problem.

This year, GE, through NBC, was allowed to acquire 100 percent ownership of FNN, cable's number-one consumer news and business service. It then promptly closed down FNN, merging it into CNBC, GE's newer and smaller financial cable program service, giving it a monopoly position in the field. In addition, a GE Financial Services' subsidiary—GE Capital—plays a major role in financing cable operators and other communications businesses. And there is hardly a weekend public affairs program on television, from The McLaughlin Group to Meet the Press to This Week With David Brinkley, that is not accompanied by GE commercials.

GE also underwrites public broadcasting public affairs programs, including the financial series Marketplace, which is broadcast weekday evenings on American Public Radio. Meanwhile, along with the owners of ABC and CBS, NBC is lobbying Congress and the Federal Communications Commission to end long-standing limits on network ownership of TV stations, programs, and cable franchises so that GE can expand its media holdings and investments still further and make what it now owns even more valuable.

In the understated words of Yale law professor Stephen Carter, "We are moving into a world . . . in which the information is controlled increasingly by those who are not totally disinterested in the outcomes produced by the system."

As we head into the twenty-first century, GE's expanding media ownership and control are symptomatic of what is happening to the nation's entire communications industry. While the number of TV channels and media outlets is burgeoning, ownership and control of our mainstream media, both print and electronic, are becoming increasingly concentrated.

In the cable industry, ten cable operators now own the systems that reach the majority of the nation's subscribers. The top cable companies also own controlling interests in most of the major cable program services and in some of the production companies whose product they carry on their systems. In 1985, while trying unsuccessfully to develop an NBC Cable News channel to compete against CNN, I was advised that in order to get our news service on their franchises we would have to offer the biggest cable operators either a piece of the company or preferential price treatment. Monopoly cable operators control dozens of television channels into the home and are capable of stifling any program service they do not own.

Today, a few conglomerates, which have no direct accountability to the American public, wield extraordinary power over the ideas and the information the public can receive. That problem did not exist 200 years ago when the First Amendment was added to the Constitution to protect the individual printer, pamphleteer, and soapbox orator from the oppressive hand of government. Now, by contrast, the new communications technologies require that government work hand in glove with media companies in the allocation of broadcast frequencies, cable franchises, and satellite paths. Far from being independent and wary of one another, government officials and communications companies have become largely interdependent. The companies make large campaign contributions to help elect the public officials who decide the communications policies that directly affect the companies' bottom line.

To deal with the growing problem of media concentration, while still preserving the libertarian principles of the First Amendment, we must make an important distinction between the message, which should be entirely free of all government interference and control, and the medium, on which reasonable limits of ownership should be imposed. Twenty-four years ago the Justice Department, on antitrust grounds, opposed an FCC decision that would have allowed conglomerate ITT to acquire ABC, a move that undoubtedly saved ABC as an independent broadcaster.

Today, the biggest cable system owners should not be allowed to own the dominant cable program services they choose for their systems. Newspaper owners should not be permitted to own television stations in the same communities. A single corporation should not be able to control all or even most of the mainstream media in any one market. GE should certainly not be allowed to own both NBC and the only national financial cable news service. Nor, following the ITT-ABC precedent, should GE—one of the nation's largest defense contractors, financial service companies, consumer product producers, and advertisers—have ever been permitted to own and control NBC, one of the nation's most powerful broadcasters. It is time to break up the growing concentration of media ownership by returning to strict enforcement of the antitrust laws.

To further stimulate press diversity in the century ahead, all of the artificial barriers that the government has erected to protect existing media franchises from additional competition should be removed. Competing cable systems should be allowed to serve customers in the same markets. Direct satellite channels should be given permission to solicit subscribers in competition with cable. Telephone companies should be encouraged to interconnect every home with fiber optic networks capable of delivering hundreds of additional television channels and sophisticated new communications services. In operating their fiber optic networks, the phone companies should be held to their traditional common carrier role, exercising no control over content and offering access to all on a first-come, first served basis.

The more information outlets we have that are either owned by many different interests or operated in a manner that opens them up to a multitude of voices, the better off our democracy will be. Competition, rather than monopolization, should characterize our national communications marketplace.

The "underlying premise" of the First Amendment, said the Supreme Court in Associated Press v. United States, was that the press would foster "the widest possible dissemination of information from diverse and antagonistic sources." It is time to return to that principle. The more sophisticated our print and telecommunications technology becomes, the simpler and more unambiguous our First Amendment protection should be.

Our national communications policy for the next century should ensure that:

1. The press, whether print or electronic (or more likely, a convergence of the two), will be totally free of government regulation, a principle contrary to the practice of the past three-quarters of a century, during which the broadcast press was licensed and regulated while the print press was left largely unrestricted and totally unregulated.

2. There will be no prior restraint on what can be published or broadcast, except in the rarest instances, during war or other crisis, when publication would create an imminent and irremediable danger to life and limb.

3. There will be no licensing of who may publish, broadcast, sell, or distribute any information. Everyone should have the right to publish in any medium without prior government approval.

4. There will be maximum diversity of ownership and control of all media to foster "an uninhibited marketplace of ideas in which truth will ultimately prevail, rather than to countenance monopolization of that market" (Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. FCC).

5. There will be universal access to all information that is considered essential for an informed public. Thomas Jefferson said in a postscript to his much-quoted comment that he would prefer newspapers without government to a government without newspapers. "But I mean that every man should receive

those papers and be capable of reading them." The principle that essential information should be available to everyone in this information-centered age is critical to a successful democracy. Increasingly, the public is being required to pay for programs and program services that once were available to all. As more channels come on stream, there is a growing dichotomy between the information that is available to the rich and what is available to the poor. No one should be deprived of the opportunity to receive important information because he or she cannot afford to subscribe to the new multichannel video services.

To honor the principle of universality, we need a policy of strong support for public television and radio, whose role is to offer information, education, and culture for the benefit of all the people. The proliferation of outlets, by itself, will not provide the programming that our civilization needs but the marketplace cannot support. The existence of these programs has until now depended on FCC regulations that required commercial broadcasters, in order to retain their station licenses, to operate as public trustees and to provide such programs in the public interest. With the deregulation of broadcasting, public subsidy of public broadcasting remains the only alternative.

In return for deregulation, commercial broadcasters, cable operators, and satellite distributors, who use the public airwaves and receive immensely valuable monopoly or near-monopoly franchises, should pay a spectrum-use tax, a cable franchise fee, or at least a transfer tax on the sale of station licenses and cable franchises. The income from these special assessments can help support public broadcasting.

Broadcast licenses, cable franchises, and cellular phone frequencies cost their original owners nothing, and then are bought and sold in the marketplace for hundreds of millions of dollars. They are the most lucrative giveaways in the nation's history. A 1 or 2 percent spectrum and franchise tax on broadcast and cable revenues, a modest payback in return for deregulation, will produce up to a billion dollars that could help public broadcasting provide vital information and much-needed cultural and arts programming to all the people.

It is time that the commercial broadcasters and cable operators stop getting a free ride at the public's expense. Ranchers, lumber companies, and off-shore drillers pay a share of their income for their use of public lands and waters. Truckers are taxed to help pay for the upkeep of the roads and highways they travel on. Similarly, instead of being given away, unused spectrum frequencies should be auctioned off, with the proceeds going to help public television and radio provide what is in increasingly short supply—educational children's programming, minority-interest fare, public affairs documents, and programs devoted to culture and the performing arts. (In Great Britain, the Conservative government has decided to partly deregulate commercial broadcasting and at the same time auction off all existing commercial television franchises, a policy far more radical than anything proposed here.)

Democracy will best be served in the twenty-first century by returning to the eighteenth-century idea of an independent and totally unregulated press, a press that is controlled by many different owners, a press that offers access to many different voices, and a press that makes available essential public affairs, educational, and cultural programming to all our citizens.

A TRIBUTE TO LETTY WICKLIFFE

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, a community pauses to recognize those residents who have added to the fabric and quality of life in a significant and long lasting way.

One such individual in Ann Arbor, MI, is Letty Wickliffe, whose mother was a native Ann Arborite and whose father was a former slave and Civil War veteran.

Letty was born on January 25, 1902, in Ann Arbor and in a few days will be celebrating her 90th birthday. Her productive adult years have earned her the rightful title of respected community leader.

Undaunted by sometimes overt and other times subtle racial prejudice in Ann Arbor, Letty emerged as an energetic and dynamic leader whose words and actions matched her commitment to a truly harmonious city.

Letty's Ann Arbor neighborhood is a model area where diversity flourishes. Many city leaders have sought Letty's leadership on issues ranging from education, she holds a degree in education from the University of Michigan, to community activities, recreation, housing, and city services. Letty has had a positive impact on these issues and many others.

More importantly, Letty Wickliffe has had an impact on the people of her neighborhood, her city, and her political party, she is a lifelong Republican. There are few people who have come in contact with Letty and not come away feeling as though she genuinely cared about them, celebrating their successes and soothing their disappointments.

Letty Wickliffe is unique—a true believer in the can-do spirit and one who has never hesitated to roll up her sleeves and get a job done.

Last year, Letty was featured in a video depicting the lives of three prominant black women of Ann Arbor. To this tribute I add my own, and ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the achievements of this grand lady.

SALUTE TO NSWSES

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a vital branch of our Armed Forces for the work it does for our national defense, and for the work it does for their community.

Recently, the Naval Ship Weapons Systems Engineering Station, Port Hueneme, was presented with the city of Oxnard's 1991 Human Relations Award for its outstanding efforts to reach out to and assist its community.

From its commissioning in 1963, the station, located in my congressional district, has required the recruiting of a professional work force with the engineering and scientific educational backgrounds capable of meeting the challenges of the rapid advance of technology at sea. It was also necessary to find the logisticians, administrators, and clerical personnel to support the station's mission. This path has taken NSWSES into a dedicated involvement and commitment to area employment and educational programs, which has grown into a significant commitment and involvement with the community.

As part of that commitment, the station sponsors an ambitious and aggressive equal employment opportunity program, which most recently added the award of two scholarships to local women students.

The station also sponsors the Naval Employment Information Center, which this year placed 1,210 persons into Navy jobs at the bases at Port Hueneme and Point Mugu. By offering counseling, testing and assistance with applications, the NEIC has assisted all comers, but especially women, minorities, and veterans.

In addition, the station was recently commended as being one of five Naval Sea Systems Command field activities that showed significant progress toward accomplishing the Navy's affirmative employment goals, with its largest gains in the hiring of Hispanics and women.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the accomplishments of NSWSES, and I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Capt. R.D. Williams III, the commanding officer, and the entire facility for a job well done.

TRIBUTE TO DAVID FRIEDMAN

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate David Friedman who is being honored by the Boy Scouts of America with the Rhode Island Good Scout Award.

David Friedman is a successful entrepreneur. His hard work and determination serves as a role model for younger Boy Scouts. David's business career began as a salesman for Paramount Foundation and Restaurant and Supply Corp. With his thirst for success, David was soon made partner and, in 1967, purchased the business for himself.

David's success continued as he acquired land occupied by Rhode Island's old mill buildings. David had the foresight to realize that these precious relics of the industrial revolution were worth preserving and that they could be updated to suit present day business needs. Mills such as Geneva Mills, Wanskuck Mills, Davol Rubber Co., Rhode Island Cardboard, and General Wire are examples of David's initiative.

In addition to refurbishing the historic mill district, David Friedman has felt strongly about improving Rhode Island colleges. With his keen business intuition, David acquired property on a 135-acre industrial park now known as Harborside Park. With this land, David introduced and developed the Johnson and Wales Culinary Arts School. The culinary arts school is recognized as one of the best of its kind in the country.

Finally, David Friedman has served his community through his involvement in as-

sorted organizations, such as the Jewish Federation of Rhode Island, of which he is a member of the board of directors. He also serves on the board of trustees for the Jewish Home for the Aged and is a corporation member of Cranston General Hospital. David's willingness to share his business abilities and personal zeal is an example we should all watch carefully.

David, congratulations for an honor well earned. You have distinguished yourself in business and volunteer organizations. I wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

A SALUTE TO IONE BIGGS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mrs. Ione Biggs, an outstanding social activist and community volunteer from the 21st Congressional District of Ohio.

For the better part of her 75 years, Mrs. Biggs has fought for the forlorn and the oppressed, articulating her concerns both at home and abroad. She has worked as a Cleveland policewoman and as a deputy clerk in Cleveland Municipal Court for 30 years. In recent years, Mrs. Biggs has devoted most of her energy to the cause of peace, attending conferences on peace and disarmament in Sweden, Holland, Denmark, and the former Soviet Union.

But, despite her involvement abroad, it is in Cleveland where Mrs. Ione Biggs has her roots and where she has attempted to effect the most social change. As president of the Cleveland-based organization of Women Speak Out for Peace and Justice, Ione Biggs has been instrumental in heightening public awareness of pertinent social issues. Last month marked the completion of Mrs. Biggs' 4-year tenure as president of this esteemed organization.

Mr. Speaker, Ione Biggs' contribution to women's groups and peace groups all over the city of Cleveland and all over the world is surpassed by few. She is true champion and pioneer of social activism whose efforts will continue to result in positive change on both a local and global level.

I am extremely proud to have a constituent like Ione Biggs and would like to share with my colleagues the following article in the Cleveland Plain Dealer newspaper concerning Ione and her many achievements.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 6, 1992]

ACTIVISM NOT DAMPENED: AT 75, WOMAN KEEPS UP QUIET FIGHT FOR OPPRESSED

(By Ted Wendling)

CLEVELAND.—Dec. 23, better known as Two Shopping Days Before Christmas, was one of those grim days when downtown was teeming with teeth-gritting procrastinators.

Those who were unfortunate enough to be inching their cars down Ontario St. that day seemed oblivious to the small throng of people who had gathered on the site of the Gateway project to demand jobs and to protest recent cuts in welfare benefits. Not a single honk of support greeted their banners and speeches.

But there, shivering in a muddy, puddled parking lot, stood Ione Biggs, just as she has stood at similar rallies for the forlorn and the oppressed for the better part of her 75 years.

And no, she was not in the least bitter.

"I'm not going to criticize people who are trying to bring joy to their friends and relatives," she said when asked whether she was frustrated that the group's message was not reaching a populace preoccupied with last-minute Christmas shopping. "At the same time, they can get on the telephone or write a letter to the governor.

"This (welfare cuts) is going to cause so much hardship to so many people. At a time when there are no jobs, there has to be some other way."

Last month, Biggs' friends threw a party to celebrate her completion of four years as president of Women Speak Out for Peace and Justice. During the ceremonies, incoming President Pearl Simon quipped, "She's not just a fair-weather friend. When you go out with Ione, you can be sure the weather will be bad."

And so it was on Dec. 23, a dreary, steel-gray day when Biggs could just as easily have stayed home and left the protesting to others.

"She is a wonderful person," Simon said. "She's genuine. She's the real thing. There's no money in it. There's no stardom. Working for a better world is her life."

Unlike many other social activists, Biggs doesn't subscribe to the "squeaky wheel" theory. Her message is rarely strident; in fact, it sometimes borders on understatement.

"We feel that human rights were violated in the Persian Gulf war," Biggs said, stating one unpopular cause championed by Women Speak Out. "But we don't try to be aggressive in our peace work. We try to educate people.

"We feel that there's got to be citizen action. People must get involved in things like this."

Having worked as a Cleveland policewoman ("I was badge No. 3024") and 30 years as a deputy clerk in Cleveland Municipal Court, Biggs in recent years has devoted most of her energy to the cause of peace, attending conferences on peace and disarmament in Sweden, Holland, Denmark and the Soviet Union. But it is in Cleveland where she has her roots and where she has attempted to effect the most social change.

"We think globally, but since we can't push buttons everywhere, we work locally," she said. "We contribute to women's groups and peace groups all over the city.

The speeches had ended, the folk singers were done, and Biggs began getting fidgety. All the while she had been talking about causes and issues, her questioner kept trying to steer the conversation back to her own career and achievements.

"I'm sorry," she said. "I have to go now."

She put on her gloves and fastened the top button of her coat. It was cold outside, there were other rallies to attend and, as this day would attest, Ione Biggs is certainly no fair-weather friend.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1992 AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE RESOLUTION

HON. CHARLES A. HAYES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the President ponders his State of the Union Address, I encourage him to focus on the real needs of this Nation. For the last decade this country has been slowly falling into an economic catastrophe—nearly 9 million Americans are unemployed and 1.6 million have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits. The current recession has showered our Nation with families that are struggling to put food on the table and pay the rent. Imagine the frustration and despair that the working fathers and mothers endure when they cannot provide food or shelter for their children, or must choose between medicine or other bare necessities. At times it seems as if this administration believes that human suffering cannot exist on American soil. People are homeless and hungry and this administration's response up until a few weeks ago was that "the recession will be over soon."

Ask anyone in any city or town in this country and they will freely tell you the state of the Union. They will tell you that we are in need of rebuilding this Nation—the economy, the infrastructure and housing. I am certain the public would be quick to tell our President that the needs for refurbishing, rehabbing and rebuilding are right here on U.S. soil. Our cities and States are suffering. We must ask why the leadership of this country, including leaders in the Congress, are so quick to support phenomenal levels of spending to help new and emerging democracies abroad, when democracy is not even guaranteed here in America. My priorities simply never change—we need to preserve democracy right here at home. We need to provide jobs for the American worker.

There is a nationwide jobs emergency and this Government must immediately respond to the need. That is why today, the very day that our President will tell us of his plan for this country, I will be introducing two legislative measures that will help set the national employment agenda, and that will help create jobs to build the infrastructure of this country, improve the quality of life and return dignity to American workers. Common sense should tell us that the best and most long-lasting way to decrease the deficit is to put people back to work—to, in fact, increase our revenue by increasing the pool of taxpayers.

The first measure, the quality of life resolution, sets a policy statement for this Nation for full employment and the second measure, the Infrastructure Improvement and Job Opportunities Act of 1992 will create job opportunities at community-based jobs projects that renovate and rehabilitate the public infrastructure including this Nation's roads and bridges, public housing, public schools and historic sites. Each jobs project will be selected by a local district executive council. The projects will provide employment training and support services

for American workers. Over 2 million people are currently eligible to participate.

The Bush administration's economic policies are clearly creating persistent high poverty and increasing the gap between the haves and have nots. Not only have the rich gotten richer, but the poor have slipped so far behind that any real recovery at times seems uncertain. With shortfalls in minimum wage, the spiraling cost of health care and the diminishing coverage of unemployment insurance, those living in poverty continue to lose out under our current economic system. This is the state of the Union and it must be addressed.

We need to know the true condition of our country—conditions which real people experience everyday. Those that are suffering because of the economy and this country's lack of direction must be recognized as part of the 1992 forecast. The quality of life is deteriorating as drugs, homelessness, and crime are on the rampage. The leaders of this country must remember that rhetoric is fine, but it does nothing to ensure that Americans have decent housing, adequate health care, quality education or a decent job at a decent wage. Investment in the citizens of this country is my primary concern and a critical starting point is a decent paying job.

As the first international union leader to be elected to Congress, I have spent a lifetime working for ordinary people. I have heralded the cause for full employment for over 50 years. Jobs are certain to be one of the major issues addressed by this Congress, in part because many of us in the Congress have maintained the vigil for a jobs bill over the years. The President and others have just miraculously happened upon the issue. The state of the Union, Mr. Speaker, is apparent on every corner of every city and town, and those that are suffering can no longer be ignored. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues' support for the Infrastructure Improvement and Job Opportunities Act and the quality of life resolution, and look forward to assisting in the battle to create a comprehensive jobs bill. Thank you.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO EFFECT HOME BUYER MARKET

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, the housing market is a cornerstone of this Nation's economic stability. According to the National Association of Home Builders, the total housing starts in 1991 were under 1 million, the lowest since 1945.

As my colleagues are certainly aware, low interest rates alone will not stimulate the housing market. The housing slump is affecting not only first time home buyers, but many families as well. Due to the current market, they cannot sell their existing residence and thus cannot build or move into a larger home. Without being able to cash in on the equity built up in their home, they will not have the assets to build or purchase a new home. Southern California, which contains some of the least affordable real estate markets in the Nation has suffered a great deal as a result of the continually soft market.

Therefore, I am introducing legislation which will allow the use of funds from individual retirement accounts, 401(k) accounts, and 403(b) accounts to be used for the purchase of a primary residence. By waiving the penalty and tax from withdrawal of money from these types of accounts, this bill will encourage an infusion of capital into the housing market. It will open up the first time home buyer market, and allow growing families to move into larger residences.

I urge my colleagues to join me in spurring a strong and extended economic recovery by providing incentive to first time home buyers and growing families.

TRIBUTE TO GLENN BRENNER

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, upon our return to Washington following the end of the district work period, we were all saddened to learn of the death of WUSA–TV sportscaster Glenn Brenner.

Glenn was quite a character. He was, first of all, a brilliant sportscaster, but more importantly, a genuinely good human being. He's the kind of guy you would like to have for a son, a brother, or as a friend—which he was to all.

He appealed to the kid in all of us. Even those who have no interest in sports whatsoever were drawn to him, and his death is so personal and deeply felt by people from all walks of life.

Glenn Brenner kept things in perspective. Sports is an important part of most Americans' lives, but it should not be an overriding presence as some would have it. Glenn Brenner and his broadcasts reflected these sensible priorities.

With his quick, incisive wit, Glenn could puncture the most self-absorbed egos. But any criticism he may have delivered was well-placed and right on target. The victims of his barbs could proudly wear the criticism as a badge of honor.

I didn't know Glenn Brenner personally, but feel as if I did. Everyone felt that way about him. His personality, warmth, and inimitable sense of humor endeared him to this community and everyone he met. The testimonies of those who knew him best confirm to all of us that Glenn, the TV person, was Glenn the human being. No disguise; what you saw is what you got.

We will miss his familiar back-and-forth, and the unscripted exchanges with his broadcast colleagues at channel 9—Sonny Jurgensen, Gordon Peterson, Maureen Bunyan, Ken Mease, and so many others. We will remember him always with a smile.

I know that I join with all my colleagues in the House in expressing our deepest sympathies and condolences to Glenn's family at this difficult time.

MATTIE GOODLETT AND CLARENCE STEWART; REFLECTING THE SPIRIT OF COMMUNITY ACTION

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two people whose lives reflect the spirit of community action. Mattie W. Goodlett and Clarence A. Stewart of New Rochelle, NY, exemplify those qualities that are best about community service. They are being honored for their many significant contributions at the Martin Luther King community action program breakfast. It is appropriate that they should be recognized on Dr. King's birthday, for their actions epitomize what he believed.

Since the early 1930's, Mattie Goodlett has been making a difference in New Rochelle by serving as an example of one whose values and esteem for education have guided those around her. Mrs. Goodlett is a living illustration of one who cares and who has devoted her time and efforts to improving the lives of her neighbors. Her community has responded generously to her contributions by citing her accomplishments through numerous prestigious community awards, such as the Citation of Distinguished Service and the Certificate of Appreciation from the city of New Rochelle. Mrs. Goodlett has maintained an active membership in the NAACP for over 50 years. She has received the Inter-religious Council Award and the United Negro College Fund Certificate of Appreciation. These honors are but a few of many. For 30 years, she was devoted to the success of the New Rochelle Child Care Program. Since her retirement in 1975, from her position as supervisor of the Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., Child Development Center, Mattie Goodlett has remained an important leader in New Rochelle.

As a professional social worker, Clarence A. Stewart, Sr., has had a distinguished career. At the Westchester County Division of Child Welfare Services, he developed the special children's services, currently known as preventative and protective services, home maker services, and the county's first family day care program. He eventually moved on from Child Welfare Services to continue his career with the Mount Vernon Board of Education until 1991, when he retired. Although it is evident by his career choice that Mr. Stewart has always been concerned about the circumstances of others, he has expanded his interest in the community by giving of his free time to many civic activities, including his 10-year service on the New Rochelle Child Care Center Commission. In 1986, he completed a 2-year term as a member of the Child Care Commission of the State of New York. He is currently a member of the board of directors of the Martin Luther King, Jr., Child Development Center in New Rochelle. Mr. Stewart is devoted to his family and has been an inspiration to many.

I am pleased to join many others in congratulating and thanking these two dedicated individuals for all they have meant to our com-

munity. New Rochelle is a better place because of their generosity and commitment.

TRIBUTE TO ANNE BELMORE

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Anne Belmore for her nomination as Outstanding Young Rhode Islander by the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Each year the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce recognizes outstanding young Americans for their achievements and contributions to their community, States and country. These individuals have exhibited excellence in business, politics, art, science, and other assorted categories. Anne Belmore is a nominee for the Rhode Island affiliate of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Anne Belmore is the coordinator for the Bristol Substance Abuse Task Force. She strongly believes that a drug and alcohol free society should be the country's top priority today. Anne has shown her intent to make our country safe from the destructive effects of alcohol and drugs in many ways. She has worked with the "Youth to Youth" group and does a monthly call-in television show on substance abuse. Anne has established and oversees a drug advisory program with the Bristol schools and the surrounding community. She regularly speaks at schools and day care centers with the belief that children are never too young to learn about drugs. Anne also works with parents of teenagers on an awareness of alcohol program. Finally, Anne has established a Portuguese Advisory Board to the Bristol Substance Abuse Task Force. Anne's commitment to drug education makes her an excellent nominee for the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Young Rhode Islander award.

Anne, through your hard work with the Substance Abuse Task Force and your efforts to educate students on the dangers of drugs and alcohol, you have exemplified the Jaycee Creed: "That Service To Humanity Is The Best Work Of Life." I congratulate you on your nomination and wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

NATIONAL OPTICIANS MONTH

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under the auspices of the Opticians Association of America, opticians across the country are celebrating January 1992 as National Opticians Month. I am particularly proud that one of my constituents, Daniel J. Donahue of Monroe, MI, is president of the National Association for Opticians.

As science makes it possible for us to live longer, good vision makes our longer lifetimes more enjoyable. As vital partners in the eyewear delivery system, opticians provide eyeglasses and contact lenses to the 60 percent of all Americans who need help with their vision.

Dispensing opticians are the eyewear experts. Through formal education programs, voluntary national certification, mandatory licensing in many States, and programs of continuing education, the Nation's dispensing opticians acquire the skill and competence to guide eyewear customers through the literally thousands of choices of frames and lenses. The eyewear consumer can be assured of just the right combination to fit the need for vision correction and the wearer's image at the same time. Additionally, dispensing opticians are important parts of the Nation's small business community and provide the competitive balance that keeps eyewear within the means of all our citizens.

I am pleased to recognize the essential role played by dispensing opticians in the pursuit of the best possible sight for all Americans, and to congratulate Dan Donahue and the association's membership on their accomplishments.

A TRIBUTE TO JUDGE JOSEPH HOWARD

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a proud man and a judge who has struggled the past 34 years to ensure that liberty and justice for all become more than just words. Judge Joseph Clemens Howard, by his own admission a black man first and then a judge, has endeavored to transform the judicial systems of Baltimore and Maryland into such in which the accused are judged by the consequences of their conduct and not the color of their skin.

Judge Howard was born in Des Moines, IA in 1922 to an African-American father and a Sioux mother. He enlisted in the Army in June 1944 at the end of his sophomore year at the University of Iowa, and served in the Philippines and Okinawa. After his honorable discharge as first lieutenant in September 1947, he returned to the University of Iowa, completing his undergraduate studies in 1950.

He pursued the study of law at Drake University, where he became the first person of African ancestry admitted into the Phi Alpha Delta Legal Fraternity in 1952. While at Drake he married Gwendolyn London in 1955.

Upon his arrival at Baltimore, he found employment as a probation officer of the Supreme Bench. He was admitted into the Maryland Bar in 1959 and joined his brother's law firm of Howard & Hargrove.

In 1964 he became assistant State's attorney. It was during his tenure in this office that he first challenged the judicial system with his charge of a double standard in rape sentencing. In 1967, as chief of the trial section in the State's attorney's office, he issued a 32-page report detailing the discrepancies in black and white rape sentencing and in the treatment of rape victims.

In November 1968, Judge Howard became the first African-American elected Associate Judge of the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City. While on the bench he issued a study challenging the inequalities in courthouse employment practices.

Judge Howard's commitment to exposing discrimination in the judicial system aroused the ire of his colleagues on the bench. He has been labeled everything from black radical to black power advocate. To these labels, Judge Howard has responded, "They can call me a lot of things, but not unjust." This is the source of his strength, he cares not how people judge him, but that justice be served.

On January 16, 1979, President Jimmy Carter nominated Judge Howard to the U.S. District Court for the District of Maryland. The Senate confirmed his nomination on October 5, 1979.

On the Federal bench, his efforts to counter prejudice have not wavered. He has worked with various committees to improve conditions for minorities in the judiciary. Through the courthouse personnel committee, for example, he has worked to increase minority employment.

Judge Joseph Howard's contributions to the Baltimore and Maryland judicial systems have been essential in establishing a basis for change. His accomplishments in the State's attorney's office, on the Supreme Bench of Baltimore City, and in the Federal Court have served to inspire people and their leaders to continue to fight for justice and equality, not only in the courts, but in the full political spectrum of their communities.

While we will miss the voice of this grand champion of justice, it soothes us to know he has spent his career inspiring a generation of admirers who will now eagerly take up his fight. In this way, Judge Howard's good works will live on, and the seeds he has sown over 34 years will continue to bear fruit, season after season.

ROYAL HIGHNESS CROWN PRINCE EL HASSAN BIN TALAL OF JORDAN

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to present here, after my introductory remarks, an impressive address by His Royal Highness, Crown Prince El Hassan Bin Talal of Jordan, presented to the Conference of the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee in Amman, Jordan on December 12, 1991.

I was privileged to travel privately to the Middle East in mid-December, where I also spoke before the conference. The thrust of my remarks before the Conference was to urge all participants in the Middle East peace talks to continue their commitment to the success of that conference, and to urge their patience with the process only now just began. I stressed that this is a historic occasion, it is unprecedented, and for those reasons alone could require weeks, months, perhaps even years, to bring forth agreement among the parties involved.

The Middle East peace talks, brought to reality by the awesome resolve of President Bush and his Secretary of State, James Baker, must go forward, and it is our responsibility, and certainly our hope, that all obstacles, real and artificial, will be identified in a timely fashion and removed from the path to a lasting and just peace in the Middle East. We have before us, for the first time in our lifetimes at least, the opportunity to see all nation states in the region receive recognition of their sovereignty, recognition of the human rights of all the peoples in the region, and the assurance that the national boundaries of all countries in the region will be secured.

During my travels, I was honored to be received by the King of Jordan, many of his government's ministers and deputies, and was received as well in the homes of private businessmen held in high esteem for their commitment to peace, to democracy, and with a willingness to engage in commerce with their brother nations throughout the region and abroad.

Also during my travels, both in Jordan and again in Lebanon, where I met with its President, his ministers, and with the press, I learned that the civilians there were deeply aware of, and committed to, the Middle East peace talks then being conducted in Washington, DC. The country of Lebanon has great stakes in the outcome of the peace talks, along with all other nation states in the region, and stands ready to continue the talks to their conclusion which, they pray, will see an end to the occupation of Lebanon.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I visited the Palestinian refugee camps. There too, to my astonishment, I found that those who are helplessly entrenched in those camps were deeply aware of the ongoing peace talks in Washington, and poignantly hopeful that the outcome of those talks will see their return to what, to them, is their homeland, too. They know their history, and they know they must no longer allow themselves to be considered as invisible, nor shall they permit themselves to be called transients in their own land.

The history of the Palestinians, Mr. Speaker, reads like a scripted nightmare written down and continually acted out. War came, and more than 300,000 Palestinians from the West Bank and Gaza left their homes to escape that war, to save themselves and their families. But in September 1967, after the war had ended, a census was taken by Israeli military authorities in the newly occupied territories, and those 300,000 Palestinians who were not there to be counted were thereafter no longer considered residents of their homeland. Those few who were counted were issued with identity cards confirming that they were indeed residents but allowed to remain on sufferance only. This has gone on, and continues to go on, for more than 25 years.

You may come away from the Palestinian refugee camps with a sense of melancholy, and certainly a sense of helplessness, but you will also come away deeply impressed by an attitude of hope in that place of deprivation and want. Hope that emanates from their hearts and minds. The Palestinian people, who are just like you and me—families with children, people with hope for a regular life, a home, an education for themselves and their children, and some dignity and quality of life—will not rest until this is made possible for them.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Palestinians in those refugee camps know about the Middle East peace talks, and they have a stake in their outcome.

Mr. Speaker, I am now pleased to present the address of His Royal Highness, Crown Prince El Hassan Bin Talal of Jordan, and recommend its reading to my colleagues in the House of Representatives.

ADDRESS OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS, CROWN PRINCE EL HASSAN BIN TALAL TO THE AMERICAN-ARAB ANTI-DISCRIMINATION COMMITTEE CONFERENCE

It is an opportunity for me to speak at rather a difficult moment in the context of current events, where so much is up in the air, where expectation is so ripe. I would like to speak directly to the issue, but at the same time, I think it incumbent on me at these very difficult times to express my personal satisfaction and, on behalf of you all, our honor and pride at the presence among us of Jim Abourezk, Nick Rahall, and all the many triple ADC members in the U.S. who, particularly in this trying period, make us feel that we are represented at the people-to-people level (where it matters) across the length and breadth of the U.S. So, I think a big hand is in order for them.

Ladies and gentlemen, "true peace is not merely the absence of tension; it is the presence of justice". These are the words of a man who lived—and died—for peace, for the end of discrimination and for the beginning of an age of tolerance, cooperation and understanding between peoples and nations. Although he died nearly a quarter of a century ago, his words remains singularly relevant in 1991, and I believe them especially apt today. For your deliberations at this conference—indeed, all of your endeavours—surely owe a great debt to the spirit and wisdom of Dr. Martin Luther King. I would like to take this opportunity to honour the memory of one who did so much to promote the ideals of non-violence, peace and true justice, and who showed how those ideals might one day become realities.

Distinguished delegates, Dr. King's dictum about the nature of peace is nowhere more applicable than in the Middle East. For almost two decades now, there have been no major wars between the Arab States and Israel. Yet neither has there been peace. In the occupied territories, all the features that one would expect to be present in a state of peace—stability, security, respect for personal and political rights—have been markedly absent. As the intifada goes into its fifth year, distribution of resources continues to be characterized by blatant injustice. This is, of course, to say nothing of the total blanket disregard of legitimate and basic human rights, such as the right to self-determination.

And I would like to take this opportunity here, to say to Israeli spokesmen once again: Jordan is, but it is not Palestine. The right to self determination for Palestinians is a right that this political lineage of Hashemites has promoted, has articulated, has sacrificed and died for over eight or nine long decades of this century. The disengagement of two years ago, however, was not a disengagement from the land of Palestine, but a disengagement that gave once again, as in the act of union of 1951, the right to the Palestinian people to exercise fully and freely their political choice. As we look at that—in the corridor of the State Department I think we realize, all of us, what it is that is at stake; a clear recognition of our distinct identity, the State of Jordan and the people of Palestine.

There is not war, but there is no peace, by any criteria. Applying Dr. King's analysis, no only is justice absent, but tension is everpresent. How then may we define this situation? It is a situation that must end, one that cannot be sustained indefinitely: That much we may safely say. But as ever, the difficult questions concern not the situation to be transformed, but the nature of its replacement.

The international peace conference held in Madrid on 30 October 1991 marked a watershed in the history of our troubled region, and pointed the way towards such a replacement. After decades of false dawns, futile initiatives, representatives of all parties concerned with the conflict gathered together, in the hope of laying the groundwork for a long-term and sustainable resolution to the conflict. It is the hope of Jordan that all parties to the process will continue down the long and difficult path to peace in the spirit of open exchange and communication. The fact that we have reached this stage at all owes much to that spirit, and we believe it alone to be capable of fulfilling our mutual desire for peace, security and mutual enrichment.

It has always been Jordan's aim to help bring about a peaceful and equitable resolution to the Palestine question and the concomitant Arab-Israeli conflict. We believe that the former lies at the heart of the latter, and that progress towards peace hinges on a comprehensive resolution of that question. It must be pointed out here that when we speak of resolving the Palestine question, we are employing a term that denotes the provision of both material and non-material human needs associated with the development, identity and autonomy of the individual and of groups with which the individual identifies.

Among the central objectives of any state purporting to act in the interests of those living under its regime are the provision of food, basic health, and purpose for all. These objectives are so fundamental to the human condition that they may be classed as minimum requirements which people may legitimately expect of states. The facts on the ground indicate that Palestinians in the occupied territories are discriminated against on a daily basis in respect of these requirements, in flagrant violation of international laws. Injustice is thus being perpetrated against the personal, national and political rights of Palestinians at the most basic levels.

With respect to the first of these requirements, I would draw your attention to a few statistics on water in the occupied territories. Since 1967, Palestinians have been prevented from drilling artesian wells for irrigation purposes. As a result, the proportion of Palestinian farmland under irrigation has declined from 27 percent to only 4 percent. Some 80 percent of water from the mountain aquifers, underground reserves beneath the hills of the West Bank, is taken by Israel. West Bank villages account for about 1 percent of all the water used in Israel. The Israeli allocation of water resources, naturally scarce in the first place, is discrimination of the most basic kind.

But although the statistics are in themselves cause for grave concern, it is the absence of the third requirement—purpose—that is most worrying. Palestinians in the

occupied territories are not provided with any tools of participation, are not accorded the respect necessary to form and manifest their collective will. Purpose requires participation. Participation provides people with an opportunity to manage their own affairs, and makes their identity an object of the state's respect. The collapse of the political systems of Eastern Europe that heralded this decade graphically demonstrated that the power of human needs of identity and autonomy—of participation—is far greater than military power. In the case of Israel, its failure to supply its Palestinian population with adequate supplies of water is therefore but a sympton—though an extremely troubling one—of its failure to provide purpose and participation, which would require involving or consulting that population at the most human level of resource allocation.

It was therefore heartening to note President Bush's call, in his congressional address of 6 March 1991, for the legitimate political rights of the Palestinians in their own homeland to be a major item for the agenda of the peace conference. At last, the Palestinian national struggle for identity has been rewarded. It has taken decades, but Palestinians are now the masters of their own destiny. In the interests of reaching a resolution to this conflict, which underpins all regional confrontations, Jordan has always demonstrated flexibility as to the modalities and format of peace talks. We welcomed the inclusion of the Palestinians, and willingly provided an umbrella for their participation: The joint delegation. At Madrid, all parties indicated both their willingness to continue negotiations, and their commitment to the ultimate objective: A just and lasting peace for all. As events unfold in Washington, as we make every effort to facilitate the goal of peace, we trust that history will vindicate our endeavors. But the path is likely to be as difficult as it will be long, and if we are to attain that elusive objective, certain factors must be borne in mind.

From the co-sponsors of the talks, skillful mediation will be required; and sensitive, pragmatic use of the influence available to them will be needed to bridge the gulf that separates the parties on fundamental issues of substance. Questions must now be raised about the co-sponsorship of the Soviet Union, in the wake of the declarations of Russia, the Ukraine and Byelorussia of their Commonwealth of Slavic States. It is our hope that the impetus from Moscow as well as Washington can be sustained, in whatever form. And I would like to refer here specifically to a statement by a prominent Soviet academician only a few days ago in London, where it became perfectly evident that independent foreign policies are to be expected by the states of that union. There are issues to be discussed that will require balanced mediation, and perhaps given this, more than one mediator will be required. As always, however, it is impossible to predict the outcome of events in the Soviet Union. The pace of international change seems to have accelerated dramatically in the last three years. We can but hope that among the dividends of this rapid transformation will be even greater impetus for peace in our region, the kind of true peace that Dr. King spoke of and worked towards.

Israel, for its part, must accept the cardinal principle of international law that the acquisition of territory by war is inadmissible. Jordan, working within the framework of the UN charter and seeking always to uphold the provisions of international law, has attempted to lay the foundations for many peace initiatives. The basis of our efforts has always been the will of the international community, embodied in UN Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338. They provide the groundwork for a practicable formula for ending the conflict in our region, by calling for the exchange of territory for peace while safeguarding the security of all states in the region, including Israel. I would like to mention here the "security dilemma", a concept of recent political science. It relates to a situation in which two or more states are locked in an arms race with the motive of enhancing their security. With each step up in the arming process, however, the other side responds with a higher threshold of commitment, ensuring continuous incremental escalation. Thus, the pursuit of security paradoxically leads only to greater insecurity.

In a sense, this is the dilemma facing Israel today. It wishes to guarantee its security, but that will never be possible under the present conditions. The gulf war merely underlined that fact, for neither did Israel's weapons of mass destruction deter attack by Iraq, nor did its illegal possession of territory hold supposed strategic value. In these days of sophisticated ballistic technology, there can only be one sure guarantee of security.

The return of the territories occupied in 1967 is absolutely integral to the peace process, and any attempt to depict it otherwise can only be based on disrespect for the legitimacy of international law. There is no other basis for the resolution of the conflict. Only if the will of the international community and the primacy of international law are upheld—and seen to be upheld—can the peoples of the region enjoy the results of peace, and live in dignity, prosperity and true security. The peace we seek goes beyond a state of non-belligerency to one of trust, coordination, and fruitful cooperation over issues such as water, arms control, refugees and the environment. Let me make it clear—this is not a soft option for Jordan. Jordan stands by the principles I referred to, and which you have heard time and again from his majesty, and I would like to make very clear that when we speak of a process, in reality, we are no better or worse than the Europeans who initiated treaties that only sought the confidence building—evolved decade by decade, generation by generation. I am not speaking of the here, and the tomorrow and the next year. I am speaking of a vision of peace. These issues are increasingly pressing, and must be addressed soon. But there is a great deal of ground to make up if the traditional barriers between the sides are to be lowered.

Perhaps the most vital element of the peace process currently in motion is the implementation of measures to build public confidence on both sides. The most urgent and central of these is a freeze on settlement construction in the occupied territories. Congressman Rahall, may I say how worried we feel, with all due respect to the slump in the building industry in the U.S. that this silver lining may be offering hope for that potential lobby—as indeed the development of further massive military sales programmes provides hope and tangible profit for the military sales lobby.

Ladies and gentlemen, I may be dwelling on the issues, but I am not here to be an after-dinner speaker. You asked for a keynote address, and by God you're going to get one.

Such a freeze would be a mark of good faith and a valuable contribution towards the breakdown of psychological barriers that exist for both parties. Indeed, all parties must refrain from actions which may undermine the continuation of the process. This opportunity has been nearly half a century in coming; we believe that none of the parties wish to wait so long for another opportunity, and that they will therefore act only in our common best interests.

Israeli settlements in the occupied territories do not only violate international law, but underline the primacy of war as an instrument of Israeli foreign policy. Jewish acquisition of land in Palestine has served as the basic vehicle of nation-building. Moreover, the question of settlements has repercussions beyond the occupied territories. It impinges directly on Jordan's national security, and the social, economic and environmental interests of our population.

If you will permit me to say: To those Jordanians and others who ask "why should Jordan get involved anyway?" 60% of the land today, 100% of the land tomorrow and 100% of the people of the people on your doorstep the day after. That is what, (in Arabic) "what business is it of ours".

I mentioned earlier some figures relating to the allocation of water in the West Bank. It is appropriate here to review briefly the history of relations between Jordan and Israel with respect to water. After Israel took control of the River Jordan by diverting its flow in 1964, Jordan began to build a dam on the River Yarmouk. This was deliberately destroyed by Israeli soldiers in the last hours of the 1967 war; and later plans to build a dam further up the Yarmouk have met only with Israeli intransigence. We believe that such policies are conducive only to continued confrontation, and the furtherance of the psychological barriers and material iniquities that characterise relations between the sides in the conflict. We believe that now is an appropriate time, and that his would be an appropriate area, for the implementation of confidence building measures on the part of Israel.

I should like to make some observations at this point concerning the effect upon Jordan of the mass displacement of people that has taken place in the Middle East since Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, last year, and it seems to be a very long year away. I have been saying for several weeks: Happy new day or happy new week! Jordan's position differs in several respects from that of other countries which have received displaced people during the recent crisis. This displacement, in the case of the UK would have been equivalent to 7 million people on the shores of England—10% of our population.

In addition to accommodating large numbers of displaced migrant workers and professions who were en route to their home countries, Jordan has had to cope with up to 300,000 of its own "returnees" from Kuwait, Iraq and other Gulf States. This amounts to an increase of 10 percent on a population that already comprised the world's highest proportion of refugees to indigenous population; at one quarter. I would add briefly that the term "returnee" had no real significance for many of these involuntary migrants, as most of them had been away from Jordan for decades. Their home, on any reasonable construction of the word, was the country which they were obliged to leave. This massive influx placed a tremendous strain on Jordan's ability to provide education, jobs, housing, health care and municipal and public services.

I would also like to ask—off the text, but on the record—who stands to gain from pres-

sure on Jordan from the West, from the south, the south-east, at a time when we are expected to proceed boldly towards peace and stability while carrying so many burdens. Jordan is, but it is not Palestine.

I am proud to tell you today that Jordan rose to that challenge, when many of you were watching CNN and the build up to the Gulf crisis, I hope it is not false modesty to remind you, that many of us were digging latrines in the desert. We paid that price, we rose to that humanitarian challenge, and thank goodness, with no loss of life due to negligence. Drawing on the same spirit and determination with which the challenges of the 1948 and 1967 crises were turned ultimately to human advantage. But I cannot deny that a tremendous strain has been placed on Jordan, the effects of which continue to be felt. However, these effects and these pressures will never deter us from honouring the principles for which our forefathers stood and fell, giving the most precious contribution of all. Yes, there is a peace dividend. Yes, there is a price of peace. Yes, the parties look to heavy investment. It is estimated that the cost of safeguarding the current standard of living is $4.5 billion. I would ask you to compare this figure with Israel's request for $10 billion in housing loan guarantees alone for the influx of a comparable number of Soviet Jews.

Ladies and gentlemen, if it is clear that there are great disparities in the region, the nature of the challenges for the future is equally clear. It is for such reasons that Jordan regards multilateral negotiations on regional issues to be of paramount importance. These issues are by their very nature transnational, and must be addressed collectively. This includes not only the regional players, but the international community at large. The region will never know true peace unless the prevailing disparities are eliminated. We see the problems of the region as fundamentally inter-related, and we view a cooperative global framework for the resolution of our inter-connected regional crises as the only approach likely to succeed. Our basic renewable commodity in this country is not oil, but thinking. Our thinking has proceeded along the lines of the regional conference on security and cooperation put forward in Europe (the Helsinki process), and it is this paradigm that I wish to put forward to you as the best chance for lasting peace in the Middle East.

In the past, questions of demography, resources and ideology have been addressed almost exclusively through the dimension of military security. But reliance on this dimension has not, as yet, produced a situation of true peace, security and stability in the region. For example, border disputes have in the past been settled by military force. In the gulf alone there have been no fewer than twenty-two active border disputes since 1990. This has in turn fueled military spending, leading to massive military debts as eager suppliers of arms compete for customers. The inter-relation between energy, arms and debt is plain to see in this context. It is an enduring and telling irony that the five permanent members of the UN Security Council, empowered to uphold peace around the world, together account for approximately 90 percent of the world's arms trade. This over-emphasis on the military dimension has given rise to what may be termed the political economy of despair.

We in Jordan seek to take another approach. It is an innovative, even ambitious, approach, but a brief parallel with developments in Europe will serve to illustrate why we believe it to be the only one with a chance of ultimate success. Europe, like the Middle East, was plagued by war and internal rivalry for centuries. It is only now proceeding down the path of integration and cooperation. Europeans view this process, the regional conference on security and cooperation, as the most likely to yield lasting resolutions satisfactory to all. This is a belief shared by Jordan.

By way of illustration, in the case of border disputes, we would favour peaceful negotiation with ultimate recourse to the international court of justice, and the implementation of a regional environmental plan. To take another example, rather than dealing with the scarce resource of water through hydraulic wars, we advocate a regional water plan that would ensure fair distribution for all.

In essence, then, our vision is of a Middle Eastern Helsinki process, a conference on security and cooperation for the Middle East. We believe that such a model would eliminate the political economy of despair. Democratisation, freedom of expression, human rights and greater awareness of a reliance on the political and economic dimensions of security provide a route towards the alternative political economy of peace, security and progress. The participation of states with a similar experience in conflict resolution is of course imperative to assist the countries of the Middle East in overcoming their difficulties.

We are aware that this vision requires the laying aside of dogma, of prejudice, of traditional hostilities. But we must learn tolerance for different ideologies. All ideologies have certain common points, together with their differences. We must develop the breadth of vision to identify and build upon these common points, while remaining firm in our demand that every government respect those universal rights of human beings and fulfill those universal requirements I spoke of earlier. These requirements, like so many of the challenges of today's world, go beyond questions of national strategy or ideological labels. They form the starting point of a humane discourse that appreciates the common ground and moves towards a constructive dialogue. We hope that such a process will occur in the Middle East, and we are pledged to do our utmost towards it.

But such a process is hollow unless there are individuals, organisations and governments committed to rectifying conditions of injustice, maintaining public awareness, and championing the causes of peace and equality, such as the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee. Your work in providing legal assistance for victims of discrimination is much needed; your efforts to disseminate salient information equally so. Perhaps most important is your work with the media, for in the forum provided by the international media, the power of individuals and organisations to promote ways of thinking based on equality and respect can be used to best effect.

Conditions that we must hope are now drawing to their inevitable end, conditions that each and every one of you may play a part in alleviating.

"As long as there is poverty in the world, I can never be rich, even if I have a billion dollars. As long as diseases are rampant and millions of people in this world cannot expect to live more than twenty-eight or thirty years, I can never be totally healthy—I can never be what I ought to be until you are what you ought to be. This is the way our world is made. No individual or nation can stand out boasting of being independent. We are interdependent".

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.

TRIBUTE TO LITE RAIL GALLERY

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Lite Rail Gallery on the occasion of their latest event. From February 3 through March 6, 1992, the Lite Rail Gallery in Sacramento will be hosting "Gathering: an Asian American Women Artist's Association Juried Exhibition."

The AAWAA was founded in 1989 by two women from the San Francisco Bay area, Florence Wong of Sunnyvale, and Betty Kano of Berkeley. The group has grown to include 75 members whose purpose is "to come together to share, to encourage and to support one another." AAWAA, while united in purpose, is a diverse group of artists, with a great range of backgrounds, ages, experiences, and styles of expression. Members are involved in visual and performance arts, music, design, video, and literature.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to commend the Lite Rail Gallery for their exhibit honoring the talents of the women of the AAWAA. The organization contributes a rich array of perspectives to American art, and I ask my colleagues to join me in extending to the Light Rail Gallery best wishes as it hosts this important exhibition.

TRIBUTE TO RICHARD A. LIDINSKY

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to pay special tribute to a man who has played a key role in the shaping of a modern Baltimore City. This man is Richard A. Lidinsky, the former executive secretary to the mayor and deputy comptroller and clerk to the board of estimates.

Since 1947, Mr. Lidinsky has used his unique abilities in the public arena to build a prosperous and successful Baltimore. Mr. Lidinsky, who recently retired after a 44-year career in the public sector, has been a key player in the development of an economically sound and successful Baltimore.

As deputy comptroller and clerk to the Board of Estimates, Mr. Lidinsky has served under eight mayors and Baltimore's legendary watchdog comptroller, Hyman A. Pressman. As clerk of the board of estimates, he has overseen the office that handles all of Baltimore City's expenditures and contracts, making the renaissance of Baltimore's neighborhoods, downtown, and inner harbor a reality.

While Mr. Lidinsky has never run for elected office, his public career spans from the administration of Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro, Jr.,

to Mayor Kurt L. Schmoke, Baltimore City's first elected black mayor. Mr. Lidinsky played an important role in the revitalization of Baltimore City in the administrations of Mayor Thomas J. D'Alesandro III, and Mayor William Donald Schaefer.

Known as "Mr. Richard" to a legion of friends and admirers, Richard Lidinsky has always remained a gentleman; able to remain above the political fray. As a religious man who attends daily mass, he was often called upon to give the opening prayer at city council meetings.

Baltimore is lucky to have had the many years of Mr. Lidinsky's public service. I fear it will be a long time before our city is graced by the presence of someone of Richard Lidinsky's personal and professional qualities. Mr. Speaker, I hope that you and my colleagues will join me and the citizens of Baltimore in paying tribute to this very special public servant.

REAGAN'S RIGHT STUFF

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, given the importance of the end of communism in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, there has been relatively little analysis of how this historic event came about. There are many causes of the dissolution of Soviet communism, but surely one of them was the indomitable spirit of President Ronald Reagan. He called the Soviet Union an evil empire. His critics scolded him. He was right. They were wrong. The fall of communism didn't just happen. It was caused, and President Reagan was among those who helped bring it about.

At this point I want to insert into the RECORD "Reagan's Right Stuff" by Gary Hoitsma, in the Washington Times, January 22, 1992.

REAGAN'S RIGHT STUFF

One of the most remarkable aspects of the extraordinary demise of Soviet communism during the past year has been the speed with which these truly historic events happened. The failed coup in August. The banning of the Communist Party. The independence of the Baltic States and the other Soviet republics. The rise of Boris Yeltsin. The fall of Mikhail Gorbachev and, concurrently, the end of the Soviet Union. All told, the unequivocal triumph of freedom.

These events came about so fast and furiously that had anyone suggested them as much as a year ago, he would not have been believed. Had he suggested them 10 years ago, he would have been ridiculed as a hopeless romantic, if not a stupid simpleton.

And, of course, he was. Ask Ronald Reagan. More than any other prominent American, Mr. Reagan consistently and accurately predicted the fall of communism and the ultimate victory of the West in the Cold War. And all the while he was doing it, all throughout his presidency, his speeches and words about the Cold War and the battle between freedom and communism were ignored or disparaged by the prevailing leaders of sophisticated opinion. Now that events have proven him to have been right, it is amazing how little credit he has received.

So just for the record, here is a brief sampling from former President Reagan's first term in office:

May 17, 1981: "The West won't contain communism, it will transcend communism. It won't bother to . . . denounce it, it will dismiss it as some bizarre chapter in human history whose last pages are even now being written."

June 8, 1982: "The march of freedom and democracy . . . will leave Marxism-Leninism on the ashheap of history."

June 23, 1982: "So the era ahead of us is one . . . that I firmly believe will end in the triumph of the civilized world and the supremacy of its beliefs in individual liberty, representative government, and the rule of law under God."

July 19, 1982: "To all those who are denied freedom, we send a message today: Your cause is not lost. You are not forgotten. Your quest for freedom lives in your hearts and in our hearts. God willing, we will see a day when we shall speak together of the joys of freedom. . . ."

Feb. 22, 1983: "History is not a darkening path twisting inevitably toward tyranny, as the forces of totalitarianism would have us believe. Indeed, the one clear pattern in world events . . . is in the opposite direction."

March 23, 1983: "My fellow Americans, tonight we're launching an effort [the Strategic Defense Initiative] which holds the promise of changing the course of human history. There will be risks and results take time. But I believe we can do it."

Aug. 23, 1983: "There's a democratic revolution going on in this world. It may not grab the headlines, but it's there and its growing. The tide of history is with the forces of freedom. . . . That's the real message, and that's the overwhelming news story of our time, even though it seldom makes the front page."

Dec. 9, 1983: "Totalitarianism on the left, just like Nazism before it, will be discarded by a disgusted humanity. Much depends on us, but we can be confident that the tide of history is indeed running on the side of freedom."

Feb. 6, 1984: "In the political world, the cult of the state is dying, so, too, the romance of the intellectual with state power is over. . . . Believe me, there are great days ahead . . . for the cause of human freedom."

March 2, 1984: "This is our moment. Let us unite, shoulder to shoulder, behind one mighty banner for freedom. And let us go forward from here not with some faint hope that our cause is not yet lost; let us go forward confident that together we will be victorious."

May 24, 1984: "The tide of the future is a freedom tide."

June 27, 1984: "It may seem an impossible dream to think there could be a time when Americans and Soviet citizens of all walks of life travel freely back and forth, visit each other's homes, look up friends and professional colleagues, work together in all sorts of problems, and, if they like felt like it, sit up all night talking about the meaning of life and the different ways to look at the world. . . . I don't believe it's an impossible dream, and I don't believe you believe that, either."

July 4, 1984: "For a while, the doctrine of Marx and Lenin seemed something new and revolutionary. And some among us said, 'Well, that's an idea. We should look at it.' Well, all for a while. Times have changed. Man has moved on, and more and more we can see that the tide of the future is a freedom tide."

Oct. 12, 1984: "With regard to the future, you ain't seen nothin' yet." In a nutshell, Mr. Reagan was right. He understood—more accurately than most—the forces at work pushing the West toward victory in the Cold War. That he deserves immense credit for articulating his vision with unmatched eloquence and clarity—even in the face of constant belittling—is undeniable. That he will ever see it in his lifetime is—unfortunately—highly doubtful.

FULLER WARREN BRIDGE REPLACEMENT

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on November 27, 1991 this body approved a $151 billion surface transportation bill. This legislation focused attention on the growing needs of American infrastructure. In all 50 States there are roads, bridges, and highways which have been deemed deficient and are in desperate need of repair or replacement. Just a week ago, that need became real to me and my constituents when the Florida Department of Transportation was forced to close the Fuller Warren Bridge in downtown Jacksonville, FL. Engineers inspecting the bridge discovered seven large cracks and closed the bridge for repair.

While this may seem like just one more local bridge project clamoring for attention, it is not. You see, the Fuller Warren is the bridge which Interstate 95 uses to cross the St. Johns River in Jacksonville and moves motorists into and out the city. The bridge was constructed 100 percent by local funds and, despite the fact that it was incorporated into the Interstate Highway System in 1969, only local funds were used for the repair of the Fuller Warren through 1989. Since that time, State funds have been used for repair. However, never have Federal dollars been spent on this vital link in the Interstate System. Anyone that has been to Florida on I-95 has traveled over this bridge. My east coast colleagues would recognize this bridge as the gateway to Florida. The closing of this bridge does not just affect the citizens of Jacksonville, but rather citizens up and down the eastern seaboard. When the Florida DOT prohibited vehicle traffic on the Fuller Warren, tourist and commercial traffic came to a standstill, causing hours of costly delays. The closing of the Fuller Warren Bridge all but closes the road to Florida whether your mission is to ship goods or visit the State.

When it was built in 1954, the Fuller Warren was designed to carry 50,000 vehicles per day. The bridge capacity is now double that and carries 100,000 vehicles per day. Because of the great needs met by the Fuller Warren Bridge and the excess capacity it is now straining to support, I am today introducing legislation to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to carry out a highway construction project to replace or repair the Fuller Warren Bridge in Jacksonville. Such a project will help meet the commercial and transportation needs of those far beyond our city and will have positive impacts across the country.

TRIBUTE TO LIONEL REMILLARD, JR.

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Lionel Remillard, Jr., for his nomination as "Outstanding Young Rhode Islander" by the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Each year the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce recognizes outstanding young Americans for their achievements and contributions to their community, States, and country. These individuals have exhibited excellence in business, politics, art, science, and other associated categories. Lionel Remillard is a nominee for the Rhode Island affiliate of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Lionel Remillard's greatest achievements come from his civil work for the city of Woonsocket. A lawyer by trade, Lionel has become involved in assorted organizations through his extraordinary fundraising and legal expertise. Lionel was the first president of the Milk Fund, Inc., an organization which provides milk all year-round to Greater Woonsocket's impoverished children, their families, and the elderly. He raised a record $93,000—plus 10 percent—in a 1-month drive for the organization in 1988 and has consistently acquired volunteers and monetary contributions for the milk fund. Lionel is also the founder of the Woonsocket Freedom Fund and the Woonsocket Columbus 500 Commemorative Committee, both of which are designed to signify the importance of liberty and happiness to the city of Woonsocket. Finally, in 1988 and 1989, Lionel was president of the Woonsocket Junior Chamber of Commerce and is still very active in the organization. Lionel's commitment to important local organizations makes him an excellent nominee for the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Young Rhode Islander Award.

Lionel, through your hard work and steadfast commitment to helping the Woonsocket community, you have exemplified the Jaycee Creed: "That Service To Humanity Is The Best Work Of Life." I congratulate you on your nomination and wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF ST. JAMES CATHOLIC PARISH

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute the 125th anniversary of St. James Catholic Parish in Bay City, MI. This joyous celebration lauds over a century of service to St. James parishioners and the Bay City community.

Since the first St. James Church was erected on the present site in 1868, the parishioners have remained steadfast in their commitment and have persevered through the loss of two churches to fire. They continue to worship today in a beautiful, modern church dedicated in 1980.

The Reverend Henry Schutjes, a European missionary was sent to preach in the Saginaw area during the lumber era around the time of the Civil War. He founded several Catholic churches in the Saginaw Valley and was a strong believer in Catholic education. Through his efforts, the first St. James Church was built on the site of the present church in 1867, and the parish was established a year later. An elementary school and high school, the first parochial coeducational high school in the United States, opened its doors in 1873, and since then, thousands of students have passed through this educational system. St. James High School merged with other parochial schools in Bay City in 1968, to form All Saints Central High School, but St. Judes Grade School continues to be recognized today for its excellence in education.

Over its 125-year history, many young men and women have answered the call to religious life. More than 70 women have entered the convent and close to 24 men have become ordained ministers. The parish can be proud of them and the environment which fostered their vocations.

Nine pastors have very ably led the generations of St. James parishioners through adversity and good times, coping with building and rebuilding programs, changes brought about by the Second Vatican Council, and demographic and economic changes in the community. This dedication has allowed St. James Catholic Church to continue its presence and mission in the Bay City area.

Please join me in commemorating this celebration of 125 years and congratulating the congregation whose steadfast faith and commitment have brought St. James Parish to this milestone. May St. James Church and its parishioners continue to provide spiritual inspiration and leadership to the Bay City community for another century.

SALUTE TO JOE ADAMS

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a true point of light in our national firmament, Joe Adams of Sunland-Tujunga, CA. For if anybody in this Nation can be said to have become involved in their community, it is Joe.

Joe has been working to make the Sunland-Tujunga area a better place to live since he moved there in 1953, after growing up in Minnesota.

Among his many accomplishments, Joe has been involved with such community groups as the chamber of commerce; the Concerned Citizens of Sunland-Tujunga, which he founded; the Foothill Area Boosters Association for the Los Angeles Police Department; the Elks Club; and the American Association of Retired People.

He helped create the day at the races and annual golf tournament for the chamber, was president of the local AARP chapter for 3 years, and perhaps most memorably was the chairman of the fundraising drive in 1970, that enabled an 8-year-old girl dying from cancer to meet her idol, Elvis Presley.

Mr. Speaker, voluntarism has always been a cornerstone of our Republic. And as our Nation returns to the values that helped make it great in the first place, I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting Joe Adams for his selfless commitment to his community.

BEN SPADARO: DEDICATED TO COUNTRY AND COMMUNITY

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who embodies the spirit of the Veterans of Westchester County and throughout our Nation. Ben Spadaro has dedicated the last 28 years to the service of veterans, the last 7 as Westchester County Coordinator of the Veterans Service Agency. In Ben Spadaro our veterans have had a strong and effective voice, a forceful, and successful advocate.

Ben, a Westchester native, is an Air Force veteran who, after serving his country, began a lifetime of service to his community. Though he has used much of his talent as an advocate for fellow veterans, Ben Spadaro has also devoted time to such groups as the Little League, the Red Cross, Lawrence Hospital, and the American Legion, to name a few. In each instance, many individuals have benefited, many lives have been enriched.

Ben has always found time to serve as a leader in providing the veterans of Westchester with a greater voice in our community, a voice that has led to an improved quality of life for everyone. Since Ben Spadaro assumed the position of coordinator of veteran affairs, Westchester veterans have known that they have always had a friend to whom they could turn in times of need.

Ben will leave a tremendous void when he retires from county service. However, we all know that his retirement will not be an end to his distinguished public service. Instead, this transition in his life will present new opportunities for Ben to devote time and energy to those causes that are so important to Westchester and our Nation.

XEROX NAMED COPIER OF THE YEAR

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in these times of a slumping economy, corporate layoffs, and declining consumer confidence, Americans have increasingly questioned our ability to compete with Japan and other nations in the world marketplace. To those who say American business cannot cut the mustard, to those

who say that the American work force is inferior, that our products are inferior and destined to remain that way I say that you are dead wrong.

A little over 2 years ago, President Bush presented Xerox with the Malcolm Baldrige National Quality Award. Xerox was one of only two companies to win the award, which Congress established to recognize outstanding American companies who have implemented total quality strategies and have significantly improved customer satisfaction.

At the time, then-chairman and chief executive officer David Kearns noted that "a focus on quality had enabled Xerox to halt erosion and begin to regain market share from the Japanese." But, Mr. Kearns went on to say, "Our quality journey is far from over. Receiving this award * * * provides further motivation to all Xerox people to continue to intensify their efforts to improve quality and to better serve our customers." And he was right.

Earlier this month, Buyers Laboratory Inc. [BLI], the Nation's oldest office products testing organization, awarded the Xerox 5100 copier—the first unit designed and manufactured by Xerox Corp. in the United States for worldwide export—as the "Most Outstanding Copier Overall" for 1991.

The award was among three major honors, including "Copier Line of the Year," which Xerox received. The annual awards recognize high quality, superior performance, and technical innovation. Award selection is based on BLI's rigorous testing and evaluation of office equipment. BLI tests copiers in various categories. It evaluated more than 40 models in 1991, including copiers from all major Xerox competitors. Evaluation includes analysis of factors such as copy quality, reliability, ease of use, productivity, and operating costs.

Commenting on the 5100 as copier of the year, BLI said it had "unprecedented reliability," and performed more than 400,000 copies between service checks. In addition, the remote interactive communications [RIC] capability of the machine provided "nearly seamless uptime * * * alerting service technicians of possible problems before they became apparent to the user." BLI also noted the image quality of the 5100, saying that it was "nearly faultless * * * the pinnacle of analog machines."

In selecting the Xerox copier line, including the Xerox 5102, 5014, 5028, 5034, 5046, 5052, 5065, 1090, and 5090 copiers and the DocuTech Production Publisher, BLI stated: "Xerox copiers consistently demonstrated that they are unbeatable in several areas: copy quality, ease of use, productivity, and technology. In addition, the Xerox total satisfaction guarantee is unprecedented."

This is the second consecutive year BLI has honored Xerox with its "Product Line of the Year" Award. The DocuTech Production Publisher, an industry-leading, high-speed digital publishing system, received a special "Most Outstanding Technical Achievement" Award.

Xerox has demonstrated that if you put the customer first and you make quality a priority it is possible for American corporations and American workers to compete and to make the best products in the world. This commitment to excellence is and remains a national priority.

TRIBUTE TO THE PLYMOUTH-CANTON MARCHING BAND

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mention the outstanding accomplishment of an outstanding group of musicians in my home district, a total of 189 musicians, to be exact. I am speaking of the first-place, national championship, Plymouth-Canton Centennial Educational Park [CEP] Marching Band.

The CEP Band has won, for the second year in a row, the Bands of America Grand National Marching Band Competition—making them the No. 1 high school band in the country, 2 years running.

Under the direction of Glen Adsit, the CEP Band has marched in numerous competitions and shows. Their many hours of hard work and practice have paid off in many ways, including the national title and winning the Michigan State Championship for 6 of the last 8 years.

At a time when so much emphasis is placed on athletic competition, I believe it is equally important to note an accomplishment such as this, which takes no less dedication, talent, and execution. As the members of the band can testify, winning a national title is the culmination of a team effort where everyone must give 100 percent.

Mr. Speaker, it is with a sense of pride that I offer this tribute to the CEP Band and ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the band members, parents, and supporters on winning the national title for the second year in a row.

IN OBSERVANCE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR., DAY

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on January 20, 1992, we in America paused to mark the anniversary of the birthday of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

With a sense of great pride, I join my fellow Americans in paying tribute to his memory as a peacemaker and as an individual who made a difference in the human and civil rights struggle.

Dr. King had a lasting impact on the effort to guarantee civil rights for all. And, while his tireless labors achieved many advances in the battle for equality, much is yet to be done.

The approval of the Civil Rights Act of 1991 and the President's signing the bill into law, I believe, are steps in the right direction. I was proud to have been a cosponsor of this important legislation and to work for its passage.

Dr. King's dream is not limited to ending the evil of discrimination. It extends to recognizing the dignity and worth of all people, and to alleviating the human suffering from unemployment, a lack of medical care, and the like.

I join my colleagues and all Americans in making a commitment to making Dr. King's dream come true.

LEGISLATION TO ELIMINATE THE EARNINGS TEST

HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask today that my colleagues join with me to eliminate the earnings test on Social Security benefits. I am the sponsor of H.R. 1575 to correct the injustice that seniors suffer from.

Retirement is something to look forward to; the golden years for men and women who have worked hard all of their lives. And yet many senior citizens benefits are being eroded by age-discriminatory legislation. Under current earnings test restrictions, seniors over the age of 65 to 69 who make more than $10,200 per year must forfeit $1 for every $3 they earn over the limit.

H.R. 1575 would remove this limit. We must encourage those who are willing to continue working during their later years, not penalize them. For too long, the Federal Government has discouraged those 65 and older from working by limiting the amount of money they can make while receiving the benefits that are rightfully theirs.

In addition, during these tough economic times, I'm sure my colleagues will agree that repeal of the earnings test would be a sound ingredient to any economic growth package that Congress may consider in the future. Senior citizens are a valuable resource in America. These men and women have contributed to the economic prosperity of this country, and we should not penalize them for wanting to continue to work.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill so that we can correct the corrosive effects of the Social Security earnings test.

TRIBUTE TO LT. COL. RICHARD MOORE

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Lt. Col. Richard Moore, a dedicated officer, on the occasion of his retirement from the U.S. Air Force. It is a special honor to salute such a remarkable leader, who made a great contribution to the McClellan Air Force Base and the Sacramento community.

Lieutenant Colonel Moore represents the finest tradition of military officers and the excellence of McClellan Air Force Base. His distinguished military career began over 20 years ago when, after graduating from Park College with a B.A. in mathematics, he chose to serve his country in the U.S. Air Force. In 1974, Lieutenant Colonel Moore completed his M.S. in logistics management at the Air Force Institute of Technology.

Lieutenant Colonel Moore applied his education to improving aircraft communication and electronic systems, transforming McClellan Air Force Base into an award-winning facility. Under his leadership, the Sacramento Logis-

tics Depot was awarded the 1989 Air Force Installation Excellence Award for its facility upgrades and improved plant layout design. His innovative ideas and dedication to quality improvement were again acknowledged when McClellan Air Force Base was honored with the President's Award for Quality and Productivity.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and enthusiasm that I speak on behalf of Lieutenant Colonel Moore. He has been an invaluable resource to McClellan Air Force Base and the Sacramento community, and his contributions will not be forgotten.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENT AND JOB OPPORTUNITIES ACT OF 1992 AND THE QUALITY OF LIFE RESOLUTION

HON. CHARLES A. HAYES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. HAYES of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as the President ponders his State of the Union Address, I encourage him to focus on the real needs of this Nation. Ask anyone in any city or town in this country and they will freely tell you the state of the Union. They will tell you that we are in need of rebuilding this Nation—the economy, the infrastructure, and housing. We need to provide jobs for the American worker.

There is a nationwide jobs emergency and this Government must immediately respond to the need. That is why today I will be introducing two legislative measures that will help set the national employment agenda, and that will help create jobs to build the infrastructure of this country, improve the quality of life, and return dignity to American workers. Common sense should tell us that the best way to decrease the deficit is to put people back to work—to increase our revenue increasing the pool of taxpayers.

The first measure, the quality of life resolution, sets a policy statement for this Nation for full employment, and the second measure, the Infrastructure Improvement and Job Opportunities Act of 1992 will create job opportunities at community-based jobs projects that renovate and rehabilitate the public infrastructure.

The state of the Union, Mr. Speaker, is apparent on every corner of every city and town, and those that are suffering can no longer be ignored. Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues' support for the Infrastructure Improvement and Job Opportunities Act and the quality of life resolution, and look forward to their adoption.

TRIBUTE TO BRENDA CLEMENT

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Brenda Clement for her nomination as Outstanding Young Rhode Islander by the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Each year the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce recognizes outstanding young Americans for their achievements and contributions to their community, States, and country. These individuals have exhibited excellence in business, politics, art, science, and other assorted categories. Brenda Clement is a nominee for the Rhode Island affiliate of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Brenda's greatest achievements come from her civic work for the city of Pawtucket. She is the president of "Pride" in Pawtucket, a non-profit organization committed to promoting civic pride. Brenda is also president of the Pawtucket Citizens Development Corp. [PCDC] which was originally an advisory board under former Mayor Brian Sarault, but has now become an independent organization that fights for fair housing. In addition to her position at PCDC, Brenda is a board member of the Affordable Housing Association as well as the Pawtucket Zoning Board of Appeals. Finally, Brenda has recently become a member of the Pawtucket City Council where she can continue her work of enhancing the Pawtucket community. Brenda's commitment to establishing fair and affordable housing in Pawtucket makes her an excellent nominee for the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Young Rhode Islanded Award.

Brenda, through your hard work and steadfast commitment to helping the Pawtucket community, you have exemplified the Jaycee creed: "That Service To Humanity Is The Best Work of Life." I congratulate you on your nomination and wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

A TRIBUTE TO BLACK AVIATORS

HON. KWEISI MFUME

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the history of African-Americans in aviation. In the early 1900's black people were denied the opportunity to learn aviation here in the United States. Their dreams of flying were shattered because of the horrible reality of racial discrimination. Over the years, these men and women were able to conquer the barriers established by racism to achieve their greatest desire: becoming aviators.

Many of these African-Americans realized that their dreams would never come to pass here in the United States so they pursued their training in Europe. One of these pioneers was Bessie Coleman who became the first licensed African-American pilot in the United States. In 1922; John W. Green, Jr., made history becoming one of the first black aviators trained by white airmen here in the United States.

After earning their wings, Americans of African ancestry were still not allowed to defend this Nation in time of war, nor were they able to participate in any meaningful way in the field of aeronautics. Black aviators used this time to prove their skills by performing as stunt pilots in air shows and by flying long distances across the country and throughout the world. However, it wasn't until 1939 that the first training program for African-Americans was established by the Civil Aeronautics Authority. The Civilian Pilot Training Program was established to train additional pilots in the event of an emergency during World War II. This program was offered at six black colleges on the East Coast and two flying schools in the Midwest.

Three years later, the U.S. Government decided to allow black airmen to participate in the defense of this Nation and established two segregated military units, as a result of pressure from civil rights leaders. On March 22, 1941, the 99th Fighter Squadron was formed, which was a separate, all black Army Air Corps. Tuskegee Army Air Field at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama was the training site. In 1943, the first all black paratrooper company, the 555th Parachute Infantry Company also entitled Triple Nickles was formed.

The all black military units proved that they could fly in combat as well as any other group. In 1948, President Harry S. Truman signed Executive Order 9981 which combined the segregated branches into one force. The U.S. Air Force was the first branch of the military to integrate in 1949. After World War II, large numbers of African-Americans were trained in the military.

The civil rights movement of the 1960's and the following decade of affirmative action were the two eras in which opportunities in aviation flourished. More African-Americans were able to work for commercial airlines, participate in general aviation, venture into aircraft design, and teach other student pilots to fly; 1970 also symbolizes the year in which the first black-owned airline in the United States was formed, Air Atlanta.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to pay tribute to these men and women who fought so long for the right to fly. The Maryland Aviation Administration has decided to honor the great aviators of America with an exhibit spotlighting contributions made by African-Americans in the field of aviation. The exhibit is entitled, "Blacks in Aviation: Then and Now." We, in Maryland, are especially proud to serve as the host State for such an important exhibition. I hope that it will not only enlighten those who see it, but educate those who may not have been aware of the many fine contributions made by African-Americans in the field of aviation.

IN RECOGNITION OF 100 YEARS OF SERVICE: THE YONKERS' YWCA

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mrs. LOWEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the YWCA of Yonkers, NY has provided its neighbors with many services throughout its rich history. This year, this fine institution celebrates its 100th anniversary. The YWCA has grown from a small association focusing almost exclusively on the concerns of young women into a multiservice organization which

has a variety of programs for individuals in all walks of life.

The YWCA of Yonkers has done a remarkable job in being able to change with the times, attending to the needs of people living in our increasingly complex society. The Yonkers Y has evolved into a dynamic organization whose enterprises encompass a wide range of activities including child care, summer day camps, educational and career exploration programs, therapeutic recreation, arts instruction, health and fitness programs, and many, many other worthwhile endeavors. Time and again, the YWCA of Yonkers has seen challenges and has responded creatively and effectively. In each instance, the Y has served to enhance the quality of life for the entire Yonkers community.

The Yonkers YWCA has been a place of sharing, of fun and laughter, of compassion, of revitalizing the body and the spirit. Its legacy is one of fellowship, a compelling foundation upon which to build a promising future. I am pleased to have this opportunity to commend the YWCA of Yonkers and to offer my sincere congratulations for 100 years of outstanding service to the community. I look forward to many opportunities to work together.

THE STATE OF BLACK AMERICA 1992

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, once again the National Urban League has given us a definitive and fact-filled report on the social and economic status of African-Americans. Their 1992 report "The State of Black America" is particularly important in this Presidential election year as it provides critical facts, analyses, and suggested solutions to problems that many prefer to ignore. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, much of our national political dialogue remains mired in the misguided, mythical policies of the 1980's that are the real causes of much of the national economic disaster that so many are experiencing in 1992. We were told in 1980, 1984, and 1988 that we could ignore our inner cities, our national infrastructure, our health care needs, and our educational system, spend unlimited amounts on defense, and, at the same time, slash taxes for the wealthy and balance the Federal budget.

In some other era, this concoction would have been called economic nonsense. In the 1980's it was known as Reaganomics. Now, the chickens have come home to roost. Tragically the African-American community once again bears the brunt of foolish and unsound national policy. This is the underlying message of the Urban League's 1992 report.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to address several specific parts of the excellent report and to highlight some of its recommendations.

The 1990 black unemployment rate for Cleveland, OH was 15.1 percent while the corresponding rate for whites was 3.4 percent. Unemployment for both races increased throughout 1991 to the point that Cleveland was cited as having one of the worst unemployment problems among major American cities. At the same time, we know that Cleveland has great need to rebuild and repair its water system, many of its bridges and roads, and to further modernize and maintain its transportation system as do many other cities. Cleveland and other cities need new low and moderate income housing. We need new and renovated public buildings.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have work that needs doing. We have work that, if done, would be an economically sound investment that would actually stimulate other economic activity. We have an available work force. Our situation in Cleveland is the exact situation that the Urban League finds throughout our Nation; work to be done in rebuilding the Nation's public health system and willing, able, and abundant workers to do it; work to be done in educating our young people and willing, able, and abundant numbers of people capable of being teachers.

Why, with all that needs doing, with all the people capable of performing that work, are so many of our citizens unemployed and increasingly desperate?

The answer is as painful as it is simple: For 12 years we have followed national policies that have consciously and intentionally ignored pressing domestic needs while being primarily focused on the further enrichment of the wealthiest among us. Some called this "conservatism" but by whatever name, the results are obvious: An out of control budget deficit, massive business failures, record trade imbalances, a growing homeless population, along with the already cited disasters in the health, education, employment, and infrastructure fields.

The Urban League's State of Black America report points a way out of our problems if we only have the will. Just as communism has failed in Europe and around the world, so has conservatism failed in the United States. Conservatism has divided and polarized the races, conservatism has us as a nation questioning our will and ability to compete in any field other than military affairs. Conservatism has created debt, narrowed our rights, and obscured our vision. We really do need a United States "Marshall Plan" to put our people to work rebuilding our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we owe the Urban League a great debt for helping us chart our way out of the situation we are in. "The State of Black America 1992" teaches us once again, that we do not advance as a nation until all of us have the opportunity to advance as individuals. This is the lesson that conservatism has forgotten.

TRIBUTE TO JOAN GOODALL EDWARDSEN

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Joan Goodall Edwardsen for her nomination as Outstanding Young Rhode Islander by the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Each year the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce recognizes outstanding young Americans for their achievements and contributions to their community, States and country. These individuals have exhibited excellence in business, politics, art, science and other assorted categories. Joan Goodall Edwardsen is a nominee for the Rhode Island affiliate of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Joan Goodall Edwardsen is co-host of the morning radio show "Jones and Joan" on WSNE. Through WSNE, Joan has promoted assorted special events to aid the Rhode Island community. Last April, Joan became involved in the Providence Recycling Art Contest, in which students from 16 of Providence's elementary schools participated. She has also assisted in events to aid organizations such as the March of Dimes, Big Sisters Association, Rhode Island Project/AIDS, the Higher Education Fund, Rhode Island Women's Network, and the Rhode Island Rape Crisis Center. In 1991 Joan was honored with the Advocacy Award for her work at Rhode Island Project/AIDS. Joan's consistent interest and involvement in these organizations clearly demonstrates her commitment to the Rhode Island community and makes her an excellent nominee for the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Young Rhode Islander award.

Joan, through your hard work with WSNE and your efforts to promote involvement in activities to strengthen our community, you have exemplified the Jaycee Creed: "That Service To Humanity Is The Best Work Of Life." I congratulate you on your nomination and wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

RAHALL SAYS "CHARITY BEGINS AT HOME"

HON. NICK JOE RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a sense-of-the-House resolution, to be known as the "Charity Begins at Home" resolution, calling for enactment and implementation of legislation providing $10 billion in U.S. loan guarantees on behalf of Americans, to be used at the discretion of our financially strapped State, city, and county governments, for unmet domestic needs.

As you all know, between today and the end of March, when the continuing resolution allowing foreign aid authorizations to be spent will expire, the House and Senate will meet in conference to agree on and adopt a final version of H.R. 2621, the foreign aid spending bill for fiscal year 1992, and beyond. When the Senate acts on the bill, the first order of business will be to attach approval, in some form, of the $10 billion in loan guarantees requested by the Israeli Government last year.

As you know the President requested, and I supported him as did many of you, that we delay consideration of Israel's $10 billion loan guarantee request for 120 days, in order to assure that the Middle East peace talks would get underway without the loan guarantees becoming an obstacle. While there are many

reasons for Members of Congress to either support or oppose the $10 billion in Israeli loan guarantees, one of the most basic, gut-level reasons for opposing them are that we do not provide the same kind of support for American housing and infrastructure needs at the State, city, and county levels, where projects ready to go are languishing on the drawing boards. Let's let the dirt begin to fly at project sites across America, generating jobs all along the way, by approving $10 billion in loan guarantees—for America! Our banks, who have imposed a credit crunch, will loosen up and loan money to State and local governments if such loans are backed by the full faith and credit of the U.S. Government.

Our States, cities, and counties have endured for 18 months, and continue to endure, a deep recession. They continue to see unemployment rates rise nationwide to the point where there are more than 10 million unemployed in the United States. For more than a decade they have had no other recourse than to continue to raise State and local taxes to meet domestic needs because Federal funding for such needs have dwindled and dried up. We have seen companies go bankrupt, banks and savings and loan institutions go belly up, and investment capital disappear.

My resolution says that charity begins at home, but it also calls for a level playing field between America and Israel when it comes to helping obtain added funds for housing, infrastructure and human needs. In short, my resolution says if we approve $10 billion in loan guarantees for Israel, we must also approve $10 billion in loan guarantees for America. It's that simple. If you agree, and wish to cosponsor, please call me or Ms. Kyle at extension 53452.

TESTIMONY BEFORE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE CONCERNING THE U.S. ECONOMY

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, on December 6, 1991, I testified before the House Ways and Means Committee and recommended some steps Congress and the President should take to improve the health of the domestic economy in both the short and long term.

I ask that my comments be made part of the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RON MAZZOLI

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to share my views on the state of the U.S. economy and legislative initiatives which may bring the economy back on track.

I hope the issues raised here in these hearings will act as the cornerstone for a comprehensive economic growth package to be developed early in 1992. I also hope that these hearings can be distinguished by cooperation and amity. We serve no useful purpose to the American people by measuring the debate on who can score the most political touchdowns.

In my view, Mr. Chairman, we are here today because of the irresponsible economic policies of the go-go '80s. Under the past two Administrations, the rich got richer, the poor got poorer, and the middle-class was asked to tighten its belt to where there were no more loops left. Ivan Boesky, Michael Milken, leveraged-buyouts, corporate takeovers, and debt financing dominated America's economic landscape. And, the American people are left holding the bag.

I believe in these proceedings we should look long-term and the short-term regarding economic growth and tax fairness. I have listened over the past year to the leaders in my community and in the Commonwealth of Kentucky regarding their thoughts on economic growth. In Kentucky, we have a Governor-elect, the honorable Brereton Jones, who knows that a strong national economy means opportunities for Kentucky in education, industry, small business enhancement, and new capital. I look forward to working with him and the Kentucky General Assembly when it convenes in January.

I have also listened to Louisville Mayor Jerry Abramson and Jefferson County Judge/Executive David Armstrong about federal initiatives and programs which best serve our community, such as the tax incentives we have extended for six months. I will touch upon those later.

Let me begin, Mr. Chairman, by addressing the charge that the Congress recessed without doing anything to help the economy. This Congress passed a very important transportation and infrastructure bill which will spend, eventually, $150 billion and put million of Americans back to work.

The Highway bill is a public investment in America—for Americans—and something we have done now to help boost the economy. I ask unanimous consent to place in the record an article by economist Robert Kuttner from Business Week in which he argues that public investment gives 100% return and it benefits the private sector. I hope the Committee will look closely at similar public investment as part of a comprehensive economic growth package.

Mr. Chairman, I want to move on to another component of economic recovery: middle-class tax relief and fairness. If we believe what some economists are saying, the way out of the recession is through consumer spending. Whatever the case may be, a middle-income tax cut is the right thing to do. Middle-income Americans, more than ever, are having real difficulties meeting their basic needs.

I am happy to be an original cosponsor of Chairman Rostenkowski's tax relief bill, H.R. 3730, which should put needed money in the pockets of over 90 million Americans, and it is a bill which will pay for itself. I believe H.R. 3730 should be a central item in any comprehensive economic growth package considered by Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I was proud to support your efforts to extend for six months the so-called tax extenders. Several of these tax extenders have been invaluable assets to my community, including the mortgage revenue bond program, the low-income housing tax credit, the targeted jobs tax credit, the employer-provided education assistance, and the research and development tax credit.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that next year the Committee may consider which tax breaks to make permanent and which to eliminate. I look forward to working with the Committee in this endeavor, and I will be ably assisted by affordable housing advocates in my District, especially in the area of low-income housing.

As to the long-term, the President wants to reduce significantly the rate on capital gains as part of his growth package. Alternatives would be to index gains for inflation and to target the rate reduction by type of capital asset, length of time the asset is held and time of purchase of the asset. For my part, I support the inclusion of some sort of favorable capital gains treatment as part of a growth-incentive and tax fairness package.

Another long-term component I would like to see resurrected is the investment tax credit which was terminated by the 1986 Tax Act. My field representative, John Kilroy, who is active in the business community, has told me on numerous occasions that we need this tax credit for investment in machinery and equipment. This investment incentive just may be the cure we need to reinvigorate our manufacturing base.

Mr. Chairman, I support the restoration of the Individual Retirement Account (IRA) and the expansion of its uses. During my town hall meetings in the Louisville community this past summer, restoring IRAs always received strong support. I am also an original cosponsor of H.R. 1406, the Super IRA bill introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Rep. Jake Pickle. The Super IRA bill has 260 cosponsors in the House and 76 in the Senate, and it is showing up in nearly every proposed growth package on the Hill.

It is obvious that enacting Super IRA legislation cannot be done by itself, but through this comprehensive growth package we are discussing. This country has to improve its savings rate for the long-term to provide our industries with the necessary capital to meet the competitive challenges of the next century.

The components of a comprehensive economic growth package I have focused on today may not be the entire equation to stimulate the economy and push it toward sustained growth. I'll leave that in the able hands of this Committee. However, I do believe strongly in middle-income tax relief, IRAs, and tax incentives to help housing and business opportunities as proven elements for growth.

Again, thanks for allowing me to offer my views and I look forward to the work of the Committee.

THE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE KIWANIS CLUB OF BAY CITY, MI

HON. BOB TRAXLER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. TRAXLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to salute the Kiwanis Club of Bay City, MI, as it celebrates its 75th anniversary on January 27, 1992. Bay City is located in my congressional district, and is home to a wonderful group of outstanding citizens in the Kiwanis Club. I certainly am proud and privileged to be affiliated with an exceptional group of business and professional men and women whose definition of a successful life includes serving others.

The Kiwanis Club of Bay City was chartered on January 27, 1917. It was the fifth club in the Michigan District and the 39th club chartered internationally. Kiwanis was founded in Detroit, MI, January 21, 1915. The original name was The Benevolent Order of Brothers. Within a year, the name had been changed to Kiwanis, taken from an Indian term "nun keewanis" which, roughly translated, means

"self-expression." The purpose of the organization is to provide community service and today Kiwanis serves the needs of over 79 countries around the world through more than 8,000 clubs like our local club.

This worldwide service organization for men and women desiring personal involvement in the leadership and improvement of their communities believes that as a group we can achieve what we cannot do individually. This is our motto and the cornerstone of Kiwanis, "We Build." Over the past 75 years, thousands of volunteer hours and thousands of dollars have been returned to the community by hundreds of Kiwanians.

The Bay City Kiwanis Club hosted the district convention in 1934. New clubs were sponsored by the Bay City club which is included Tawas in 1945, Standish in 1954, Ki-West Bay City in 1959, and Caseville in 1967. There have been three Michigan District Governors from the Bay City club. These included Art Cansfield in 1946, M.J. "Andy" Anderson in 1952, and E.F. "Pete" Fletcher in 1964. Michigan District Lieutenant Governors from the Bay City club include Seth Babcock in 1925, Walt Rechlin in 1927, Joe Kerr in 1931, Stewart Polvrie in 1935, Art Cansfield 1942, M. J. Anderson 1948, Ben Boutell 1952, E.F. Fletcher 1960, Carter Combs 1965, Ralph Hudson 1969, Richard Nelsen 1981, and William Dawson, our current Lieutenant Governor-elect.

In terms of community service projects, the club has consistently supported such programs as the Fellowship of Christian Athletes, Boys and Girls Club of Bay City, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, Special Olympics, provision of 4-H Fair Awards. Since 1985, we have maintained a $10,000 Kiwanis Scholarship Program through Bay Area Community Foundation. We also sponsored outstanding local high school sophomores for leadership training through the Hugh O'Brien Youth Foundation. One of our most enduring projects continues to be a sponsorship of a baseball team originally begun in 1932, in the American Legion League, and continuing today the Northwest Little League here in Bay City.

A 75th anniversary is a significant event and I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the current president, David J. Corcoran. His name will be listed along with the first Kiwanis Club of Bay City president, Homer E. Buck, a former postmaster in Bay City. Please join me in celebrating the 75th anniversary of the Kiwanis club of Bay City, and wishing many more years of success and good will.

THE FEDERAL PROGRAM PERFORMANCE ACT OF 1992

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I and seven of my colleagues introduced the Federal Program Performance Act of 1992, an innovative piece of good Government legislation which would build upon the advances made in the Chief Financial Officers Act of 1990 and increase the accountability and effectiveness of the Federal Government.

Americans have many different conceptions of their Federal Government—as a provider of certain services, as a defender of freedom, and as a protector of territorial boundaries. But in recent years Americans have been inundated with so much disheartening news about Government deficits, scandals, and waste that they have come to view Washington's monolithic departments and agencies as poor performers. To date, Congress has not systematically explored ways of determining how the Federal Government has performed year to year and of constructively using this information.

The time has arrived for Congress to take an intelligent, reasoned step toward a yearly requirement that: First, the Government set goals for its own performance, and at the end of the year compare how it performed with how it wanted to perform, and second, this result be reported to the Congress, the President, and the people so that lessons can be learned and necessary policy and administrative changes made. Therefore, I drafted the Federal Program Performance Act of 1992, which would institute such a requirement of performance measurement and reporting but account for the emerging nature of knowledge in this area by mandating a 2-year pilot program in selected Federal programs. At the end of this period, the Office of Management and Budget would report to Congress and the President on the success of the pilot project and would outline a plan for a permanent performance measurement and reporting on a broader scale.

We hear all the time that the pie of Federal Government money is shrinking, that Federal programs will have to get by with less. Reducing waste is a logical response to this reality. Finding how a program is performing its intended mission is perhaps the most important link in the chain of determining how to make a program work the best it can. As it stands now, this information is lacking. My bill would start the ball rolling toward changing that.

Mr. Speaker, I and my cosponsors hope that our colleagues will join us in supporting this timely and essential bill.

SALUTE TO DEPUTY DEENA ROSEN

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor an outstanding law enforcement officer, Los Angeles County Sheriff's Deputy Deena Rosen, who has retired after more than 21 years of service to the residents of the county.

Deputy Rosen graduated from the L.A. County Sheriff's Academy in 1970. She began her career at Sybil Brand Institute for Women, where she was instrumental in establishing the first high-power housing area for female prisoners. In fact, the first female inmates housed there were the women followers of Charles Manson.

In February 1974, Deputy Rosen transferred to the newly opened Crescenta Valley station, becoming the first female deputy assigned to patrol there. After 4 years there, she was transferred to Special Investigations in 1978, where she worked criminal intelligence assignments in both traditional and nontraditional organized crime, antiterrorist investigations, and criminal intelligence liaison in the Antelope and San Gabriel valleys. Her last assignment was detective, Division Headquarters, where she was a member of a joint Federal task force investigating and prosecuting corruption in law enforcement.

Mr. Speaker, Deputy Rosen retired during the congressional recess, but she will be honored by her former colleagues at a retirement dinner on February 7. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting her for her dedication to law enforcement and in wishing her well.

COMMEMORATING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOMBING OF PEARL HARBOR

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the congressional delegation attending the ceremonies commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Japanese bombing of Pearl Harbor in early December. Of the various speeches made on that occasion, one of the very finest was delivered by Congressman BOB STUMP of Arizona. He spoke at the ceremony centered upon the various battleships and those who died in them on December 7, 1941. Congressman STUMP represented the State of Arizona and I include his address as follows:

REMARKS BY HON. BOB STUMP

Governor Waihee, Members of Congress, Governors, survivors of Pearl Harbor, ladies and gentlemen.

It is a great honor to represent governor Fife Symington and the people of the great State of Arizona on this momentous occasion.

As a young sailor in 1943, I was stationed on Ford Island, overlooking the U.S.S. Arizona—what a privilege to return to the site where our nation's heritage was given a rebirth through the sacrifices of our fathers, brothers, friends and shipmates.

Their memorial is not the ceremony we conduct here today. It is not in the silent, cool chambers of a sunken vessel, nor solely in the words of ceremony.

Their memorial is in the joyful hearts of the children of Gdansk, in the joy of the oppressed as they stream over a crumbled wall, and in the tearful reunion of free Estonians.

Their memorial is in the democratic election of the St. Petersburg mayor, and yes, in an entire world that says to the fallen of the U.S.S. Arizona * * * "Your sacrifice for freedom and democracy is now complete."

The world embraces the cause for which you died, the American idea that all men—all men—are created equal and endowed by their creator with the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

To the memories of those we honor, you could not have known when you took your oath and accepted the uniform of your country that you would be among the first to face tyranny's most vicious effort to snuff out freedom's flame.

But you did, and we are here to again say "thank you." Thank you on behalf of a grateful state, on behalf of a nation that cherishes her liberty, and on behalf of a more peaceful world.

"U.S.S. Arizona" is a name synonymous with courage, heroism and sacrifice. On December 7, 1941, the world was awakened to your message that freedom is not free, that the cause of America is right, and that you would not permit tyranny to prosper.

This December 7, 1991, your sacrifice is undiminished. The American idea is still the hope of the world, and tyranny has collapsed because of what you did here.

Today, we remember your loss, but we rejoice in the legacy you lovingly preserved.

May God bless the memory of those who perished here—

May God bless the United States of America.

TRIBUTE TO PAMELA KOPPLIN

HON. RONALD K. MACHTLEY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MACHTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Pamela Kopplin for her nomination as Outstanding Young Rhode Islander by the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Each year the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce recognizes outstanding Young Americans for their achievements and contributions to their community, States and country. These individuals have exhibited excellence in business, politics, art, science and other assorted categories. Pamela Kopplin is a nominee for the Rhode Island affiliate of the U.S. Junior Chamber of Commerce.

Pamela Kopplin's greatest achievements come from her commitment to educate Rhode Island's youth. Pamela is treasurer of Volunteers in Newport Education, an organization of 200 volunteers who help 8,500 students through customized tutoring programs. She also helps Johnson and Wales students study hotel management. Last June, Pamela was elected president of the Newport Rotary Club. Since her election, she has made it possible for four Rogers High School seniors to attend the monthly Rotary meetings as well as become guests of a Rotarian working in their chosen field. Pamela's participation in the Rotary program, along with the Volunteers in Newport Education, has made it possible for students to excel in school and follow their interests. Her commitment to education makes Pamela an excellent nominee for the Rhode Island Junior Chamber of Commerce Outstanding Young Rhode Islander award.

Pamela, through your hard work as treasurer of the Volunteers in Newport Education and your efforts to help educate students, you have exemplified the Jaycee Creed: "That Service To Humanity Is The Best Work Of Life." I congratulate you on this nomination and wish you all the best in your future endeavors.

A SALUTE TO FORMER CONGRESSMAN RALPH H. METCALFE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent paper authorized by Philip A. Grant, Jr., a professor of history at Pace University in New York. Professor Grant has written an outstanding paper entitled "The Congressional Career of Ralph H. Metcalfe of Illinois" which he delivered at the Illinois History Symposium in Springfield, IL, last month.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to include this superlative text in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and I hope that my colleagues will take the time to review his work:

THE CONGRESSIONAL CAREER OF RALPH H. METCALFE OF ILLINOIS

On February 20, 1970 Democratic Congressman William L. Dawson of Chicago announced that he would not seek reelection to a fifteenth term. Dawson, a member of the House of Representatives from Illinois' First Congressional District since 1943, for twenty years had been Chairman of the Committee on Government Operations. Outranked in seniority by only thirteen of his four hundred and thirty-five colleagues in the House, Dawson was also the senior Black serving in Congress.[1]

Within days after Dawson announced his decision to retire, two prominent Democrats launched their candidates for their party's congressional nomination. These two gentleman, Ralph H. Metcalfe and A.A. "Sammy" Rayner, would each wage intensive four week campaigns prior to the March 17 House primary.

Metcalfe, fifty-nine years of age, was a graduate of Marquette University. An accomplished athlete, Metcalfe had excelled as a member of the United States track team at the 1936 Olympics. Between 1949 and 1952 he had served as Illinois Athletic Commissioner. Since 1955 Metcalfe had occupied the post of Alderman from Chicago's Third Ward, and at the time he began his quest for a seat in Congress was in the midst of his second year as President *pro tempore* of the Chicago City Council.

The primary race between Metcalfe and Rayner was by every standard a spirited one. While Metcalfe and Rayner were in basic agreement on national issues, they differed quite substantially in their attitudes toward the political climate in Chicago itself. Metcalfe, who for many years had been a local supporter of Democratic Mayor Richard J. Daley, stressed his experience in government and his dismay at the violent tactics of various street gangs in Chicago. Rayner, who had twice engaged in unsuccessful primary bids against Congressman Dawson, denounced the conduct of the Chicago police force and applauded the gangs as a legitimate social force in the city's impoverished Black community. Metcalfe strove to portray himself as a mainstream liberal Democrat and a responsible public servant, while Rayner, expressing contempt for Mayor Daley and the political structure of the Cook County Democratic Party, proudly described himself as a militant.[2]

Inasmuch as Congressman Dawson had always prevailed in primary races with the wholehearted assistance of the tightly disciplined Democratic organization, it was generally anticipated that Metcalfe would triumph in the primary. While Rayner had boundless energy and was a dynamic public speaker, he had polled only 30.1% of the primary vote in 1964 and 38.1% of the primary ballots in 1968. The key question was whether Metcalfe would win the primary contest by a convincing margin, thereby suggesting that Mayor Daley retained the confidence of the bulk of the Black population in the First District.

On primary day approximately sixty thousand Democrats availed themselves of the opportunity to choose between Metcalfe and Rayner. The early returns indicated that Metcalfe was faring well in all parts of the First District and was attracting a minimum of two-thirds of the popular vote. By midnight it was certain that Metcalfe had defeated Rayner by a resounding majority. The official result of the primary contest was as follows: Metcalfe, 42,575 (71.1%) Rayner 17,346 (28.9%).

The fact that Metcalfe won the primary by more than forty-two percentage points established that the Daley organization remained the dominant political force in the First District.[3]

Illinois' First Congressional District, consisting of seven wards on the South Side of Chicago, was heavily Black in its racial composition and overwhelmingly Democratic in terms of party registration. During the decade between 1935 and 1945 the district has been represented by the only Black in Congress. According to the Census of 1970, the district had a Black proportion of 88.9% within its boundaries. No Republican candidate had been elected from the First District since 1932, and in his five final general election campaigns between 1960 and 1968 Dawson's share of the popular vote had averaged 78.8%. In the presidential election of 1968 Richard M. Nixon, the Republican nominee, had attracted a mere 9.2% of the vote in the district. In addition to being predominately Black and Democratic, the district contained many low income inhabitants and was populated largely by individuals who did not own the homes or apartments in which they resided. The First District had the third lowest per capita income of the twenty-four districts in Illinois and 77.8% of its citizens were tenants rather than homeowners.[4]

In the 1970 general election Metcalfe's Republican opponent was Janet Roberts Jennings, a thirty-seven year old teacher and former aide to the late Republican Senator Everett M. Dirksen. Two years earlier Jennings had secured only 15.4% of the vote when she challenged Congressman Dawson. Jennings in 1970 conducted a token campaign, undoubtedly suspecting that no Republican could possibly carry the First District. On election night Metcalfe assumed an insurmountable lead over Jennings. The final figures from the First District were:[5] Metcalfe, 93,272 (90.8%); Jennings, 9,287 (9.2%).

Metcalfe was sworn in as a member of the House of Representatives on January 3, 1971. A few days later he was appointed to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, a panel on which he would serve continuously throughout his tenure on Capital Hill. In addition to his official committee assignment Metcalfe promptly joined in the Congressional Black Caucus.[6]

During his first term in the House, Metcalfe was conspicuously at odds with the domestic and foreign policies of Republican President Richard M. Nixon. Defying the

[1] Footnotes at end of article.

President's wishes, Metcalfe firmly opposed both the Supersonic Transport (SST) and the extension of the military draft. Like his fellow liberal Democrats, he favored an increase in the prevailing federal minimum wage, the strengthening of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), additional funds for the United States Office of Education, proposed constitutional amendments guaranteeing equal rights for women (ERA) and assuring the right to vote for eighteen year old citizens, and overriding all of Nixon's vetoes. Metcalfe also sharply differed with Nixon on the wisdom of continuing the Vietnam War, repeatedly voting for measures to hasten American withdrawal from Southeast Asia. Concurring with the priorities of the Congressional Black Caucus, Metcalfe endorsed a series of demands that the President reverse his neglect of the problems of poor people and racial minorities.[7]

In November 1972 President Nixon won Illinois and forty-eight of the forty-nine other states, gaining reelection by the largest numerical majority in American political history. Notwithstanding the facts that Nixon carried Illinois by 874,707 votes and Cook County by 171,039 votes, Congressman Metcalfe handily defeated his Republican opponent, Louis H. Coggs. The election statistics in the First District were:[8] Metcalfe, 136,765 (91.4%); Coggs, 12,877 (8.6%).

Consistent with the thrust of his legislative record during his first term, Metcalfe remained adamant in his fundamental disagreement with President Nixon's policies. Metcalfe favored reducing levels of defense spending, prohibiting aid to Turkey, passing the War Powers Bill to restrict the President's authority on overseas troop deployment, and mandating a specific date for the withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. On major domestic issues he supported an increase in the government's commitment to mass transit, public financing of presidential elections, eliminating windfall profits for oil companies, imposing stricter controls on automobile emissions, and the adoption of the Judiciary Committee's recommendation that President Nixon be impeached. In addition to voting to override all of the President's vetoes, Metcalfe opposed the confirmation of Nixon's choice for Vice-President, House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford.[9]

By the beginning of the congressional election campaigns of 1974 President Nixon had resigned in disgrace and was succeeded by Vice-President Ford. The Democrats, surmising that the Republican Party had been severely damaged by the prolonged Watergate scandal, hoped to wrest at least two dozen House seats from the Republicans. When all the ballots were tabulated the Democrats in 1974 registered a net gain of forty-three seats. Among the two hundred and ninety-one Democratic victors was Congressman Metcalfe, who was re-elected by 70,802 votes (93.7%).[10]

During the period between January 1975 and November 1976 the Democratic Congress and President Ford clashed on numerous occasions. Indeed Ford vetoed a total of thirty-six bills, many of which the House attempted to override with Metcalfe's unqualified support. Metcalfe's hostility toward the Ford Administration was just as pronounced as had been his disenchantment with the Nixon Administration. While Ford served in the White House, Metcalfe voted to end the oil depletion allowance, provide emergency financial assistance to New York City, require comprehensive disclosure of lobbying activities, prevent the deregulation of natural gas, and forbid both economic and military aid to South Vietnam. As an activist member of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, he was also deeply involved in behalf of bills to authorize the development of synthetic fuels, initiate a federal no-fault insurance program, and control toxic substances.[11]

Perhaps the most noteworthy development of Metcalfe's political career was his estrangement from Mayor Daley. By the time Metcalfe was serving his third term in the House, he was charging that the Mayor condoned police brutality and was completely insensitive to the problems afflicting Chicago's Black community. In 1976 Daley and his organization endorsed Erwin A. France, a Black, to oppose Metcalfe in the Democratic primary. Metcalfe scored an emphatic victory over France, outpolling his challenger 56,101–22,028 (72.1%). Metcalfe's well-publicized primary triumph was widely interpreted as a severe rebuff to the once omnipotent Daley organization.[12]

In the general election of 1976 Metcalfe was opposed by A. A. "Sammy" Rayner, who had switched to the Republican Party. Metcalfe easily disposed of Rayner, winning re-election to a fourth term by 116,485 votes (92.3%). Based on the cumulative results of four primary races and four general election contests, it seemed that Metcalfe was invincible in the First District.[13]

By 1977 Metcalfe had advanced to the posts of ranking Democrat on the Consumer Protection and Transportation Subcommittees of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. Deriving advantage from his seniority and joined by a growing number of Black Democrats in the House, Metcalfe was anxious to cooperate with the new Democratic Administration of President Jimmy Carter.

While reserving a degree of independence, Metcalfe was quite supportive of Carter's policies. In 1977 and 1978 he voted for the Common Site Picketing Bill, the creation of a Consumer Protection Agency, a sweeping measure to regulate strip mining, an expanded Legal Services Corporation, the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment bill, and a proposed constitutional amendment granting congressional representation for the District of Columbia. Predicated on his longstanding opposition to Pentagon spending, Metcalfe opposed the B-1 Bomber and the Defense Procurement Authorization and the Defense Department Appropriation Bills of 1978. Most of Metcalfe's efforts in 1977 and 1978 were directed toward finding an effective solution to the vexing energy crisis, a task primarily within the jurisdiction of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.[14]

In March 1978 Metcalfe was renominated without opposition to a fifth term in the House of Representatives. Since his G.O.P. opponent again would be A. A. "Sammy" Rayner, his re-election in November was considered virtually certain. Unfortunately, Metcalfe unexpectedly died on October 10, 1978, thus ending a comparatively brief congressional career.

Since Metcalfe did not possess sufficient seniority, there was no likelihood that he could have attained the chairmanship of a standing committee. He did, however, rise to the position of tenth ranking Democrat on the forty-three member Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. While serving on the committee, he became steadily involved in the complex process of seeking solutions to such problems as no-fault insurance, toxic waste, synthetic fuel development, and the awesome challenges posed by the energy crisis plaguing the nation. It would be an exaggeration to assert that Metcalfe was a dominant figure on the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, but it would be entirely reasonable to conclude that he worked diligently and constructively with his fellow committee Democrats to produce an impressive number of meaningful legislative proposals.

As a Black Democrat from one of the least affluent districts in the United States, Metcalfe favored an agenda geared to improve the plight of poor and disadvantaged Americans. His support for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, the Legal Services Corporation, the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Bill, and a large number of other measures to promote social justice and racial equality established his belief that the national government had a genuine responsibility to address the shortcomings of the country's domestic situation. During Metcalfe's eight years on Capitol Hill the number of Blacks in the House grew from twelve to sixteen, and, as a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, he strove to dramatize a more compassionate approach to inequities within the nation.

While Metcalfe began his congressional career as an apologist for Mayor Daley, he eventually became a harsh critic of Daley and his organization. Elected to the House in 1970 with the blessing of the Daley organization, Metcalfe in 1976 had to withstand a primary challenge engineered by Daley himself. By the end of his fourth and final term in Congress, Metcalfe had become an experienced legislator with close ties to the House Democratic leadership, an independent spokesman for a large portion of Chicago's Black citizenry, and a political figure with an unblemished record of electoral success.

FOOTNOTES

[1] Maurine Christopher, *America's Black Congressmen* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1971), pp. 185–193; Bruce A. Ragsdale and Kathryn A. Jacob (eds.), *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774–1989* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1989), p. 885; United States Congress, *Congressional Directory, 1970* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1970), pp. 49, 238–250, 267; *Times*, New York, N.Y., February 21, 1970, p. 15.

[2] *Congressional Quarterly*, March 6, 1970, pp. 706–707; *Times*, New York, N.Y., March 15, 1970, p. 48.

[3] *America Votes, 1970* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1971), p. 101; *Times*, New York, N.Y., March 18, 1970, p. 22; March 19, 1970, p. 27.

[4] *Congressional Districts in the Nineteen Seventies* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1974), pp. 55–56; Kenneth C. Martis, *The Historical Atlas of United States Congressional Districts, 1789–1983* (New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, 1982), pp. 168–203; *Guide to U.S. Elections* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1985), pp. 932, 937, 942, 947, 952, 957, 962, 967, 972, 977, 982, 987, 992, 997, 1002, 1007, 1012, 1018.

[5] *Congressional Quarterly*, July 24, 1970, p. 1850; October 16, 1970, p. 2509; November 6, 1970, p. 2773; *Guide to U.S. Elections*, p. 1023.

[6] United State Congress, *Congressional Directory, 1971* (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1971), pp. 48, 273.

[7] *Congress and the Nation, 1969–1972* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1973), pp. 167–168, 225–232, 501, 503, 505–510, 600–602, 717–718, 720–723, 915–923, 925–930, 1003–1006, 27a–29a, 32a–35a, 38a–40a, 44a–47a.

[8] *America Votes, 1972* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1973), pp. 104–105, 113.

[9] *America at the Polls, 1973–1976* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1977), pp. 86–87, 155–165, 293–295, 508–512, 522–524, 847–851, 866–867, 890–890, 927–929, 949, 988–995, 1016–1018, 1020–1023, 1028–1030, 1032–1035; *Almanac of American Politics, 1974* (Boston: Gambit, 1973), pp. 262–264,

[10] *America Votes, 1976* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1977), p. 110.

[11] *Congress and the Nation, 1973–1976*, pp. 91–95, 267–269, 270–272, 311–313, 441–446, 494–497, 840–843, 895–900,

1039–1042, 1044–1047, 1052–1055, 1058–1061, 1118–1124; *Almanac of American Politics, 1976* (New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, Inc., 1975), pp. 267–270.

[12] *America Votes, 1976* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1977), p. 119; *Congressional Quarterly*, March 6, 1976, p. 511; March 20, 1976, p. 608.

[13] *American Votes, 1976*, p. 116.

[14] *Congress and the Nation, 1977–1980* (Washington: Congressional Quarterly, Inc., 1981), pp. 133–136, 140–141, 355–356, 402–403, 415–417, 468–485, 544–549, 717–719, 838–839, 1011–1013, 1016–1019, 1024–1027, 1030–1033.

TRIBUTE TO FAUN PLATT OF TIPTON, MI

HON. CARL D. PURSELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. PURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to mention the 90th birthday of a truly outstanding woman in my home district—Mrs. Faun Platt of Tipton, MI.

I have known Faun for many years, and believe her community involvement and volunteer service over the years stands as an example of the difference one person can make.

A former school teacher, Faun attended college at Illinois Normal, Michigan State, and Siena Heights. She has served as a juvenile probation officer and juvenile county agent, and is the past president of both the Adrian Womens Club and the County Federation of Womens Clubs.

Faun also became involved in politics, serving in numerous capacities, including being a member of the State Central Committee and attending three national conventions. She also remains active at the Tipton Community Church, where she has taught Sunday school and participates in the women's fellowship.

Currently, Faun is active with the senior citizen's center and the Tecumseh Orchard Terrace Board.

The mother of two sons, Faun now has five grandchildren and seven great grandchildren. She also keeps busy with music, baking, and entertaining.

Mr. Speaker, Faun Platt celebrated her milestone birthday with her friends and family on January 12, and I wish to take this opportunity to ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating her.

MR. IACOCCA SPEAKS OUT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the recent trade trip to Japan by President Bush and certain business executives, including Chrysler CEO Lee A. Iacocca, underscored the magnitude of our strained trade relationship with Japan. I know Mr. Iacocca and his corporate colleagues began the trade venture on a most optimistic note. Yet, these captains of industry returned with a realistic sense of just how much work has to be done before the playing field is really leveled between the United States and Japan.

Upon his return from Japan on January 10, Mr. Iacocca gave a report to the Economic Club of Detroit. It is an honest, blunt, and noteworthy commentary on the trip that I commend to all of my colleagues:

PREPARED REMARKS BY L.A. IACOCCA, CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD, CHRYSLER CORP.

Thank you, Joe. It's always good to hear one of your bosses say something nice about you. In fact, these days it's nice to hear anybody say something nice about you! But, Joe has been a member of our board now for about two years, and he has really thrown himself into the car business. Especially the way we do it at Chrysler. Maybe you've noticed—he's even doing his own TV commercials now!

But Joe, I gotta tell you, I think that battery you mentioned is just about dry. I've had a tough four days: A day to fly over, a day to fly back, and in between a brutal schedule of meetings and dinners designed to kill you just in case the jet lag didn't do the job!

The Japanese are terrific hosts. But they can wear you out. And you can forget what you went for. That didn't happen this time, though.

This was a historic trip, and let me start by saying that President Bush set a very important precedent. He took some heat here and in Japan for dragging along a business delegation. The Japanese didn't know what to make of it, except something had changed.

What's changed is that economics finally made it to the front of the plane along with the generals and admirals and all the Foggy-Bottom types. In the past, we weren't even invited to ride coach. The President just tore a page from Japan's book. Their leaders have always taken business people on missions like this because they've always put economics first.

Now we're doing that. The Cold War is over. The Soviet threat is gone. Now we can start taking care of business, like Japan has been doing for the past 45 years. I think the trip served notice on that. Seeing American government and business arm in arm for the first time ever sent the Japanese a message.

And I think they got it.

They got it. They didn't like it. They fought it. (Boy, did they fight it!) And they made a start in dealing with it. But only a start. Frankly, from a Detroit perspective, a weak start—but a start.

The Big Three told the President that there should be a 20 percent reduction in the bilateral deficit in '92, going down another 20 percent a year for the following five years until things are balanced. For 1992, it would have meant $8 billion off the total deficit. That translates to about 180,000 Americans going back to work.

That's pretty much what I told the Japanese in a speech there back in 1985. I said their trade surplus with the U.S. was going to backfire. It was then $37 billion. Now it's $41 billion, so you know how well they took my advice.

But this time the President was there, too. And I think they listened better.

Back in '85, I said they could take that deficit down any way they wanted: Sell us less or buy more—their call.

We weren't specific this time, either. But with autos and parts 75 percent of the problem, you'd have to assume that they'd be the major part of the solution.

Hell, I didn't go to Japan to help open the rice market. The last time I looked, we don't grow any rice in Detroit. Correcting the deficit has to be done mainly in auto trade. There's no other way.

The Japanese know that as well as we do. And they're going to fight it every inch of the way, believe me. They have this industry targeted, and they're not about to take us out of their gunsights.

The auto parts commitment looks good on paper, but we can't sort out how much of the increase they promised will come from their keiretsu suppliers here.

And on autos, we got promises to make their dealers available to American imports. Again, a start. But they wouldn't touch the bigger issue—the flood of vehicles they're sending into this market. And if they're serious about closing the auto deficit, that's where they have to start.

I don't want to get into specifics. It's too soon. I literally saw the auto agreements late Thursday afternoon in Tokyo, and I've been on an airplane most of the time since. I need some time to sort things out, but I'll agree with the quotes I saw from Red Poling and Bob Stempel this morning: Too little, way too little!

This trip didn't resolve this country's trade problems with Japan. Nobody expected it to. (You can't resolve in three days problems that have developed over 20 years.) But it did help bring those problems to a head. And frankly, that's been long overdue.

The President applied pressure—lots of pressure. Now Congress will have its crack. Dick Gephardt, John Dingell, the Levin brothers, Lloyd Bentsen and others have a bill in to force the 20 percent deficit reduction that the Big Three were suggesting. So, stay tuned!

It's important that we use all the leverage we have because without persistent outside pressure the Japanese will not move at all. And why should they? They're winning! They're beating our brains in. So we'll have to move them.

We have to because we can't handle the sheer size of the imbalance—$41 billion in one year with one country * * * over $400 billion in a decade.

And the pattern is still the same: We ship them food and chemicals and raw materials—just like a colony. And they ship us value added cars, and machine tools and electronics and all the high-tech stuff where the good, high paying jobs are—just like a mother country.

We can't handle the unemployment that deficit causes, or the closed plants and lost tax base, or the insidious Japanese economic and political power within the United States that comes with it.

In this city, of course, we've got a special problem. The Big Three sold less than 15,000 vehicles in Japan last year. (Hell, the Japanese transplants in this country sold more cars in Japan than that!) By contrast, Japan sold about 3.8 million cars and trucks here.

They say it's because our stuff is junk. I don't think so. I wonder if there's another reason. Like maybe because my Jeep Cherokee costs $12,000 more in Japan than it does here because they won't accept our certification, and everything has to be inspected, and there's a maze of red tape and distribution costs not designed to protect the Japanese consumer, but to keep us out!

If they don't like our cars, then you'd think they could take some American parts and help shave the auto trade deficit. They haven't done that, either. America sells less than $2 billion worth of parts a year to Japan, but we sell $22 billion worth to the rest of the world.

It's funny, isn't it? Those parts are good enough for Mercedes and BMW, but not good enough for Isuzu and Daihatsu.

We're getting stiffed. And when Detroit gets stiffed on autos, then America gets

stiffed on trade—period. That's because cars are America's rice. Any argument for protecting Japan's rice farmers is an argument for completely shutting Japan out of our auto market.

Now, I don't want to do that. And I don't know anyone who does. I'm called a protectionist, but I'm really a free trader. The thing I want to protect is free trade. And the way you do that is to retaliate against those who don't believe in it.

And if there's anyone here who thinks for a second that Japan practices free trade, I've got some S&L's I'd like to sell you.

Japan has no use for free trade. It certainly has never practiced fair trade. No, what Japan practices is predatory trade. Let me give you an example of how that works.

We recently got some research from a major American financial institution. You'd know the name but they asked us not to use it because they do some business in Japan, and they got some of the numbers from their clients there.

According to their study, Japan lost $11.7 billion in North America from 1987 through 1990 in autos. (No 1991 numbers yet.) That comes as a surprise to the average American who thinks Japan must be making a ton of dough in this market. But no, they lost almost $12 billion. How could they stand the pain? No problem. They made $36.4 billion during the same period in their own protected home market.

You see, they operate from a sanctuary. They have almost no competition at home and they won't allow any foreign competitor to be a factor in their market. In total, all foreign auto makers from all over the world have only three percent of the Japanese market. In Europe, foreign companies have 15 percent, and in the United States they have a whopping 35 percent of our car and truck market.

Well, when you operate from a sanctuary—when your market is closed and the other guy's is wide open—that gives you some neat options. You can gouge your own consumers (if they'll stand for it, and the Japanese consumers do), keep all your people employed, and use some of the profits to grab big chunks of the other guy's market.

And that's what's happening. They are simply taking about one-third of their enormous profits from their protected sanctuary at home and subsidizing their market share grab here. That's ugly mercantilism at its worst.

It's a good strategy. They get full employment * * * they get huge profits overall * * * and when they control this market (and they're getting closer every day) they'll call all the shots and will get their investment back—in spades!

Sure, American consumers get a break—for a while. But Japanese consumers get an even bigger one: you see, they all have jobs. Remember—the most useless consumer is an unemployed consumer.

One way they give Americans a break is through "dumping," and we have laws against that. It's obvious that it's going on, but it's hard as hell to prove because their real costs are camouflaged within their keiretsu arrangements. And even when you can prove it, why bother?

The Commerce Department found Japan guilty of dumping minivans last month, and Toyota immediately declared victory because our government said Toyota wasn't cheating by much! They break our laws, but only by a little, so that's okay. I'm sure Toyota expects the same slap on the wrist Toshiba got a few years ago for selling submarine technologies to the Soviets. (Back when there were Soviets.)

The case isn't closed, though. Now commerce wants to look at those Japanese books and see if the actual costs they provided are as high as they claim. (And if they are real, then Japan's reputation for efficient, low-cost production goes right down the toilet.)

But, so far, the Japanese would have to be stupid not to keep breaking our laws—and the Japanese are not stupid.

And now, the EC has capped Japan's sales there at 16 percent through the end of the century. (Without Japan complaining, by the way.) That leaves the U.S. and Canada as the only free market for autos on the entire planet * * * the only dumping ground left for Japan's excess auto capacity.

The Japanese have almost 7 million units of excess auto capacity (75 percent of world overcapacity) and now almost all of it is targeted at us!

But the problem is even deeper than dumping, and targeting and scoffing at our laws.

It's time that we came to understand in this country that Japan's economic structure is as different from ours as ours is from Cuba's. Oh, it has all the trappings of free enterprise, but it is different * * * fundamentally different.

Their closed home market * * * business-government collaboration through MITI to penetrate foreign markets * * * an export/import bank set up to fund that market penetration * * * the keiretsu * * * banks holding most of the corporate equity * * * deliberate inefficiencies like distribution and agriculture * * * the second-class status of the consumer * * * and even a form of government which is really more of a bureaucracy than a democracy. All of these not only make Japan different, many of them are patently illegal in our country.

They have a managed economy in Japan, pure and simple. It may be economically irrational by everything we learned in school, but it works and works well for one simple reason: Because they have the giant American market as a dumping ground and a pressure relief valve.

Among other things, that means they don't have recessions. They're just not allowed there. The only time they've had negative growth since we helped them recover from the war was in 1974, but that was due to the OPEC oil shock not the business cycle. We're in our eighth recession since the war, but Japan has been immune.

Let me ask you—do you think we'd be in a recession right now if we had a completely open market roughly twice the size of ours to sell into, and if we had an endless web of formal and informal barriers that kept those people out of our market? Do you think we'd be closing plants and laying people off?

Recessions are bad news for America, and terrible news for this city. But U.S. recessions have been terrific news for Japan. That's when they've grabbed most of our market.

Over the past few years, we Americans have not only had to deal with a recession, but a war too. They haven't had either of those burdens to worry about in Japan. It's just been business as usual, and that included grabbing another 9 share points of our car market while we weren't looking. That's what they've gained since car sales began to soften here in 1988.

It happens every time our economy hits the wall. OPEC One in the early 70's—four quick points. OPEC Two, '79–'81 (the one that almost killed Chrysler)—eleven points. And now nine more points when we hit our third recession, plus Desert Storm!

That seems to be the pattern—they gain a point a year in the good years * * * a point a quarter in the bad ones * * * 10 more points every recession. That's a recipe for taking the whole U.S. auto market in just a few more downturns!

And I, for one, am fed up hearing from the Japanese (and some Americans, too) that all our problems in this industry are our own damn fault. We don't have idiots running General Motors, Ford and Chrysler or our suppliers. Our workers are not lazy and stupid.

I won't do a commercial here, but take a look at the new Dodge Viper at the show * * * at the new Jeep Grand Cherokee * * * and the new LH cars coming next summer—the Dodge Intrepid and Eagle Vision. I'll put them against anything in the World! (It's too damn bad that this trip to Japan on unfair trade is obscuring the fantastic new products coming from Chrysler and all of Detroit in 1992. They are world class!)

Sure, the Japanese make good products, too, and they're the economic force to be reckoned with in the world today. But let's not be too impressed. Any one of the Big Three would be geniuses too if we operated from the same closed sanctuary * * * if we had a huge, wide open market like the United States to sell into * * * if the government ran interference for us * * * if we could prohibit our dealers from selling foreign cars * * * if we had company unions and sweetheart deals with our banks and our suppliers * * * and if American consumers wouldn't squawk about paying six times the world price for rice and $12,000 more than U.S. sticker price for a Jeep.

And we'd also be heroes if we had the same cost of capital over the years. The cost of capital in Japan has historically been as little as half of ours. It's about equal now, but you can bet that's a temporary problem they'll correct.

Chrysler just spent a billion dollars each on a new tech center and a new inner-city assembly plant. If I were in Japan at the time I contracted for those facilities, I could have built them both for the same billion!

So let's not be so hard on ourselves. The Japanese aren't geniuses, except when it comes to manipulating our own laws and our own market for their ends.

I picked up FORBES Magazine a couple of years ago and saw a quote that tells it all. It was by Hideo Morita, the son of Akio Morita of Sony. His father, as you know, likes to lecture us poor, dumb Americans on what it takes to succeed in business these days.

Here's what his son said.

"My father's generation knew that they were playing by different rules from the West when it came to trade, but they pretended they didn't understand the rules. That's why they won."

By the way, I met Akio Morita this week in Tokyo for the first time, and I think we liked each other. One good thing American and Japanese business leaders did this week was talk to each other. Maybe we should be doing more of that.

But, ladies and gentlemen, I think it's time to make Japan not only understand the rules, but to play by them. And it might even be time to change some of those rules.

That won't be easy. I've been dealing with the Japanese for a long time, and I have immense respect for their ability to win at the negotiating table. One way they do it, of course, is to hire away our negotiators. In recent years, one-third of our top trade negotiators have quit to become foreign lobbyists, most of them for the Japanese. So when

we send someone over there to bring home the bacon for us, we don't know if the trip will turn into a job interview.

There are also a few other things we should have learned by now when it comes to dealing with Japan.

First, our problems with Japan are unique. We trade with about 200 countries all over the world, but two-thirds of our deficit is with one single nation—Japan.

So we have a separate and distinct trade problem between ourselves and Japan. And that probably means we need a separate and distinct set of trade rules for Japan than we have for everybody else.

Second, we have to deal both with Japan's closed market and Japan's business practices that affect this country. I'm talking about things like the keiretsu, dumping, and control of key technologies. Focusing only on opening up the Japanese market would be a mistake. We can get snookered if we spend all our energy prying it open but by then our companies are too weakened to take advantage of it.

Third—and this comes from bitter experience—be careful what you ask for because you might get it.

We twisted Japan's arm to quit artificially depressing the yen. Beginning with the Plaza Accord in 1985, they finally stopped. The yen doubled in value. That should have promoted an explosion of exports for us and cut down on imports.

We thought the currency swing would even out the trade. Guess what—since then we've run up almost $300 billion in red ink with Japan, and that translates to about 7 million jobs. So something is rotten—and not in Denmark—but in Japan!

The currency swing would have helped if Adam Smith's theories worked in a world of managed trade. But they don't. They're totally irrelevant. We went from zero to 40,000 units in Europe in just a couple of years, but had a helluva time getting to one thousand in Japan. In that big market we should be selling at least 25,000!

Honda has sold 400 Cherokees for us so far. They got generous this week. They promised to triple Jeep sales to 1,200 by 1994. And triple the dealers from 100 to 300. That means by 1994 each of those dealers will sell one Jeep every three months! Wow. How did we get so lucky?

We also told Japan that if it wanted to sell in this market, it should manufacture in this market. That turned out to be a mistake. Our mistake was taking them at their word when they said transplants would replace built-up imports under the so-called "voluntary" restraints. (Nothing in writing, of course, because it was "voluntary.") They reneged, and about 70 percent of the transplant capacity became incremental.

Since those quote "restraints" in 1981, seven transplant facilities have opened and a net of nine Big Three assembly plants have closed. (General Motors' announcement a few weeks ago will change that ratio considerably.) In those ten years, our auto deficit with Japan has gone from $14 billion to $30 billion * * * every new job created has cost two old ones * * * and every new dollar contributed to America's economy drove out two old ones.

We also find ourselves with a helluva competitive disadvantage because the average transplant worker is 12 years younger and the cost of his labor is $12 an hour less. That's because all the new Japanese plants except Mazda in Flat Rock were built in cornfields. The younger work force uses less health care and they're at least 20 years away from collecting pensions.

The location of the plants also allowed the Japanese to duck any of the responsibilities of urban America. The Big Three work force is 21 percent minority. The transplants have only about 5 percent minorities. When you drive by our new Jefferson North plant, keep in mind that no Japanese company would ever consider building that plant.

So the lesson in dealing with Japan is that you have to focus on results not on process. If you let them decide on the process (and the timetable), you will never see results. At least not the results you were looking for.

And one of the results we must insist on is employment.

The content of every Japanese import represents about 1 percent American jobs. For the transplants, it represents about 48 percent. But for the Big Three it's about 88 percent. It's pretty obvious where our priorities should be if the objective is to get Americans back to work. Ford, General Motors and Chrysler (and their suppliers) create American jobs. The Japanese don't.

President Bush said it right when he started his trip: The issue is jobs * * * jobs * * * jobs.

Finally, we have to beware of the ancient art of Oriental patience. (And it is an art!) They don't solve problems in Japan, they manage them.

The Japanese are masters at making you peel the onion. You get through one layer and you're looking at another one just like it. One year we negotiated on oranges, the next beef, the next tomato puree, and even ravioli, yet! And in the end we're further and further behind.

I used to believe myself that the Oriental "long view" was a great virtue and something we could learn from the Japanese. I was wrong. It's not a virtue at all, it's a weapon and we have to disarm them if we're going to get anywhere at all.

We need to use our own weapon; good old-fashioned American impatience. That means demanding a solution to the problem now. And retaliating now if we don't get it. We've already shown all the patience anyone could ask—45 years of patience. First, we helped them rebuild. Then, we defended them. Then, when they were fully recovered, we continued to allow them open access to our market while they shut us out of theirs. We even had to listen to such crazy and insulting excuses as our skis aren't right for their snow and our construction companies don't understand their dirt.

Japan has a set of standard excuses every time they're called to task.

They say they create jobs in this country. Not true. Net-Net, they cost us jobs by the tens of thousands.

They say Japan is unique and deserves special treatment. I say Japan has had a free ride long enough.

They say they're changing. They're not. The only changes that will take place in U.S.-Japan trade relations are those that we force them to make.

They say if you criticize Japan you must be a racist. That's just a weak attempt to cut off the criticism.

And finally, they say all the problems are our fault. That's like blaming our army and our navy for Pearl Harbor because they weren't ready. Japan targets this market and particularly this industry, especially when our defenses are down (like in a recession) and we deserve what we get—that's the way that argument goes.

No, we don't have to show any more patience toward Japan. None. That's a trap. And we don't have to listen to any more phony excuses from Japan. We've heard them all for too long.

It's also sad to hear Japan's propaganda mouthed over and over by some American editorial writers and columnists, including some in this city, which is hurting so badly right now. And it's ironic because none of them have ever faced even a single minute of foreign competition in their entire lives. (Not even fair foreign competition!)

We have local pundits telling the Big Three how to compete in the global automobile market, when they can't even compete with the paper down the street. They rail against protectionism while they live under the protection of a JOA—the ultimate irony!

The standard line is that Japan's protectionism hurts Japan more than us. Tens of thousands of people in this city and this industry just went through a Christmas season wondering if they'd have jobs when they came back. Most of them are still wondering. Tell them the Japanese are just hurting themselves! (And tell those who've already lost their jobs.)

The Japanese and their Chrysanthemum Club apologists in this country (I call them "economic pacifists") are always warning against "quick fixes." As a result, we get no fixes at all. I've got news for them—it's high time for some quick fixes, and they should then be followed by more permanent repairs.

Now, I'm getting into the question time, so let me wrap up.

If I sound a little hot under the collar about what Japanese trade and economic policies are doing to this country and this city, I am. Our argument, of course, is with those Japanese policies, not the Japanese people. And with our own policies that have tolerated those Japanese policies. Both must be changed and changed fast mainly in our own self-interest, but in the long run for the good of the Japanese as well.

I warned them back in 1985. I said "you guys are protecting the wrong market. You're protecting your market in Japan when you should be protecting your market in America."

They didn't listen. Forty percent of everything Japan ships comes here. When American workers are out of a job. Japan's customers are out of a job. They haven't seemed to catch on to that yet.

In their own self-interest, the Japanese have to truly open their market, back off on their penetration of this one, and reform their whole economic structure to align it with ours and that of the rest of the world.

That would mean some severe problems for them. Maybe they would even have to taste recession for the first time * * * deal with unemployment * * * close some plants * * * and accept some of the responsibilities, the pain and the dislocation that comes with living in a global economy.

I think the real test of the value of the President's trip this week will be whether or not Japan finally accepts some of those realities and responsibilities.

Before the trip, some of the Japanese press was speculating on what quote "souvenirs" would have to be offered to placate the Americans this time. I resented reading that. I know we've been soft on Japan in the past, but I don't think we're going to keep selling our economic independence for a few beads and trinkets. And I don't think the $400 million Japanese lobby in this country is going to keep American resentment in check much longer.

I'm optimistic after this trip. Naturally, I'll wait to see the results, and I've been disappointed before. But this trip was more

than show. I know, some people both here and in Japan said that Stempel, Poling and I were being used. We were called, among other things, "window dressing," "clowns," and "potted plants."

Well, I can't speak for anybody else, but if I can help convince the Japanese that Americans won't tolerate their predatory, mercantilistic attack on this industry and this market any longer, then I'll be glad to sit around like a potted plant all day long.

But if they keep pretending they don't understand the rules * * * if it turns out that they stiffed the President of the United States and sent him home with only a few "souvenirs."

RICHARD A. LIDINSKY RETIRES FROM OVER 43 YEARS OF SERVICE IN CITY GOVERNMENT

HON. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mrs. BENTLEY. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1992, I will have the distinct honor and pleasure of attending a retirement dinner for a close friend and long time associate, Richard A. Lidinsky.

On December 24, 1991, Richard Lidinsky officially retired from more than 43 years of devoted service to Baltimore City government. Richard began work as executive secretary to the mayor in 1947 for then mayor of Baltimore City, Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr. He only left city government for 3 short years from 1959 to 1962 when he served as administrative assistant to Congressman Edward A. Garmatz. In 1962, he returned to city government as deputy comptroller and clerk to the board of estimates and served in that position until his retirement in December 1991.

To invest over four decades of one's life to one particular employer reflects a great deal of devotion and satisfaction with one's place in life. Richard has served under eight mayors and was well known for his loyalty and integrity.

A lifelong resident of Baltimore, Richard always has been seen as a permanent fixture in the city. Born in Baltimore in 1920, he graduated from Baltimore City College and later from University of Baltimore Law School. Married for 46 years to the former Angela Miller, Richard is the proud father of four children. He has a strong sense of community and has always been active in numerous civic and community affairs.

Without a doubt, Richard Lidinsky has a great wealth of character and spirit. In his case, success does not just carry a professional connotation.

Not only has Richard demonstrated a great deal of commitment and dedication to his work and family, but he has also given of his time and energy as a member of the board at Bon Secours Hospital and Mercy Hospital. In addition, he was former president of the Young Men's Bohemian Democratic Club, seventh ward, Baltimore City and was active in Baltimore City Retirement Board and Baltimore City Pension Board while serving as comptroller. He is active in charitable causes such as Little Sisters of the Poor and has been active in church affairs at St. Wenceslaus Church, the ethnic home and church of the Czechoslovakian community.

Typical of his character, upon his retirement, Richard offered to work as an unpaid consultant to the city. It appears that Richard's dedication to the city has superseded the lure of an easy retirement. Since his retirement, he has worked nearly every day imparting his knowledge and experience in service to Baltimore.

While it does not reflect our usual concept of retirement, Richard is not your ordinary person. His hard work and dedication truly is commendable. A strong family man, active in his church and community, Richard Lidinsky personifies the American dream and American work ethic.

Mr. Speaker, my fellow colleagues, it is with utmost respect and admiration that I congratulate Richard Lidinsky upon his retirement from over 43 years of devoted service to Baltimore City government. May he have continued success and happiness in the years ahead.

THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MACE

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in celebrating the 150th anniversary of the historic mace. The ebony and silver mace used by the House of Representatives is one of our most cherished symbols. It is the symbol of authority of this body and one of the oldest and most important symbols of our Nation's democracy.

The sesquicentennial anniversary of the mace marks a historic occasion for the House of Representatives. It also marks an important occasion for my family. I am particularly proud to be a Member of the House during this 150th anniversary of this silver mace. Fifty years ago, my father, Thomas D'Alesandro, was also a Member of this House, as a Representative from Maryland. I appreciate the majority leader, Mr. GEPHARDT acknowledging my father in his remarks. When I was sworn in as a Member of Congress in 1987 my father was here to celebrate this honor. To me, the mace is a symbol of my family's continuing service, as well as this institution's continuity. In becoming a Member I became a colleague of my father's. Each of us who serves in this body shares the privilege of calling every other Member who has ever served here our colleague. The mace symbolizes this line of colleagues which stretches across the history of our Nation.

I am proud to be serving in the House today, 150 years after the 27th Congress gathered in the old House Chamber to use the mace for the very first time.

A SALUTE TO THE CUYAHOGA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION ANNUAL PUBLIC SERVANTS MERIT AWARD RECIPIENTS

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, on February 26, 1992, the Cuyahoga County Bar Association will host its 46th Annual Public Servants Merit Awards luncheon. The event recognizes the exceptional work and contribution of selected county court system employees with the presentation of the Franklin A. Polk Public Servants Merit Award.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to salute the Cuyahoga County Bar Association and this year's six public service recipients. I also am pleased to take this time to recognize the man for whom these awards are given. For 40 years Franklin Polk chaired the Cuyahoga County Bar Association's Annual Public Servants Awards luncheon and although Attorney Polk passed away last year, he will always be remembered for his great love of public servants and his commitment to recognize their contributions.

This year's honorees are: Donald M. Corrigan; Kenneth Rudolph Glenn; M. Richard Odom; Colin Alfred Sheehan; Sharon L. Streich; and Raymond L. Knight and at this time, I am pleased to share the accomplishments of these six individuals with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, Donald M. Corrigan serves as deputy clerk for the Cuyahoga County Probate Court. He is a graduate of Lakewood High School and received a B.A. from Cleveland State University. Mr. Corrigan also served in the U.S. Army and received an Honorable Discharge in 1963. He has been employed as a machine operator, sales clerk, and tow motor inspector.

Mr. Corrigan is an active member of the Democratic Party and has assisted in election campaigns of judicial and nonjudicial candidates. He is also a member of the Cuyahoga County Golf Association and the Ridgewood Men's Golf Association and is the past president and secretary of the Cuyahoga County Golf Association. In his spare time, he enjoys playing golf and various card games.

For the past 10 years, Kenneth Rudolph Glenn has served as deputy chief probation officer for the Cuyahoga Adult Probation Department. His career with the Court of Common Pleas spans over 25 years. Mr. Glenn previously served as a social worker for the State of Ohio Department of Youth Services and he played professional basketball for the Harlem Globetrotters.

Mr. Glenn graduated from East Technical High School, received a B.A. degree in sociology from Niagara University and a M.S. in criminal justice administration from Mercyhurst College. He and his wife, Betsey, are the parents of two children, Kevin Glenn and Andrew Kopf.

In 1986, Mr. Glenn was appointed to the Ohio Attorney General Victim's Assist Board and is the past president of the Community Action Against Addiction. He is also a member

of the American Correctional Association, the Ohio Correctional and Court Service Association and in his spare time, enjoys traveling, golf, fishing, and painting.

M. Richard Odom is a detention officer at the Juvenile Court. His work for the court spans over 15 years having previously served as an assistant supervisor of transportation, financial analyst, activities worker, and child care worker.

A graduate of Shaker Heights High School, Mr. Odom will receive his B.A. in sociology from Cleveland State University in June 1992. He and his wife, Joanne, are the proud parents of M. Richard Odom, II, Matthew R. Odom, Lisa Y. Harris, Cheryl L. Hill, and Adrienne Prince.

Mr. Odom enjoys playing a variety of sports, listening to jazz, playing cards, and spending time with his three grandchildren.

Colin Alfred Sheehan has worked as a supervisor at the Cleveland Municipal Court since 1974. His service to the Cleveland Municipal Court spans nearly 25 years, having served as a deputy bailiff prior to his appointment as supervisor. Mr. Sheehan is a graduate of West High School and has received a certificate from the Cuyahoga County Sheriff's Department, the U.S. Marshall's Service, and the Ohio Peace Officer Training Council. He and his wife, Joan, are the parents of Colin Kelly Sheehan (deceased), Kevin Robert Sheehan, Colleen Roberta Sheehan, and William Thomas Sheehan.

Mr. Sheehan is an avid sports enthusiast and physical fitness guru. One can still find him playing basketball and volleyball, swimming, and walking. In his spare time, Mr. Sheehan also enjoys cooking and interior decorating.

Sharon L. Streich has spent nearly 25 years working at the Domestic Relations Court. She is currently the director of administrative services at the court. She was previously employed with Ridgewood Country Club and Central National Bank.

A native of Cleveland, Ms. Streich is a graduate of Byzantine Catholic High School. She and her husband, George, are the parents of Edward Jacob Streich.

Ms. Streich considers herself an avid Cleveland Browns enthusiast who enjoys playing golf in her spare time and spending time with her husband and son.

Raymond L. Knight is the supervisor of the archives department at the county clerk of courts. He has previously worked at the Aluminum Co. and Apex Manufacturing Co.

Mr. Knight is a graduate of East Technical High School. He has also served in the U.S. Army, receiving an honorable discharge in 1947. During his service in the Army, Mr. Knight became a boxing champion.

Mr. Knight and his wife, Joy, are the parents of Raymond L. Knight, Jr., Clerance B. Knight, Larry Knight, Carol Knight, Patricia Knight, Kevin Knight, and Kenneth Knight. He was the former president of the old 12th Ward Democrat Club and in his spare time, he enjoys fishing and gardening.

Mr. Speaker, it is a special honor for me to join in the salute to these exemplary public servants. Employees such as Mr. Corrigan, Mr. Glenn, Mr. Odom, Mr. Sheehan, Mrs. Streich, and Mr. Knight make the system work for all of the residents of the Cleveland metropolitan area.

I join the Cuyahoga County Bar Association and the chairperson of the annual award luncheon, Mercedes Spotts, in paying tribute to the 1992 Public Service Award recipients.

HONORING A LIFE OF DEDICATION TO INTERNATIONAL SERVICE, DUMOND PECK HILL

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, a friend of mine and former chief counsel to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Dumond Peck Hill, died recently and I would like to honor the memory of this man who dedicated much of his life to international service.

Although Peck Hill left a position in Government many years ago, he continued to participate both professionally and on a volunteer basis in people-to-people programs linking countries and their leaders.

One organization to which he was particularly close was the Partners of the Americas. Partners recently voted to have its Volunteer of the Year Award—the highest recognition given annually to Latin, Caribbean, and U.S. citizens who excel in volunteer efforts—carry Dumond Peck Hill's name forever.

Partners, which was very important to Peck Hill, is the private sector successor to the Alliance For Progress, founded by the Kennedy administration to link U.S. leaders and institutions with their counterparts in 31 Latin and Caribbean countries.

Last year, I was pleased to host this organization when it celebrated its 25th anniversary in the hearing room of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs. Peck Hill served as the Partners legal counsel for 20 of those 25 years and it was a credit to him that the organization can point to a fine record of growth and management in its many programs.

We will miss Peck Hill, but we know that his many contributions to international service will live on in the work he did for organizations such as Partners of the Americas.

I feel honored to have known and worked with him.

EXPLANATION OF REMOVAL OF NAME AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1330

HON. RICHARD H. STALLINGS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. STALLINGS. Mr. Speaker, today I removed my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1330, the Comprehensive Wetlands Conservation and Management Act of 1991. I support many of the provisions in the bill, such as those which would allow the Corps of Engineers to delegate wetlands protection to the States, and those which would require compensation to owners of wetlands if a permit for use was denied, consistent with other Federal takings.

However, recent field tests using the legislation's proposed definition show that 60 to 85 percent of the remaining wetlands in Idaho would no longer be classified as a wetland. In fact, known waterfowl production areas such as the Roswell Slough and the Centennial Marsh would not fit the new definition. Given this new information, I cannot cosponsor this legislation as it is currently drafted.

In developing the definition of a wetland we should be focusing our efforts on balancing the rights of small businessmen and landowners against the unquestionable value of wetlands to the ecosystem. Unfortunately, as with so many important issues facing our country, politics seem to be getting in the way of developing a comprehensive long-term policy. I am concerned about this, and I appreciate the many Idahoans who have taken the time to express their opinions and concerns about the future of Federal wetlands policy.

On December 19, the four Federal agencies involved in the 1991 wetlands identification manual issued proposed rules, beginning the process of codifying the 1991 manual into formal agency regulations. I do not support the unscientific and arbitrary regulations that are currently being proposed by the administration. I believe we need a single wetlands definition that is scientifically based, defensible and measurable.

In an effort to restore science to the wetlands debate, I recently voted for an amendment which would have required the National Academy of Sciences to conduct an independent review of the science and methodology of determining what constitutes a wetlands area. While this amendment failed narrowly, it would have provided significant scientific underpinnings for the development of a wetlands delineation manual. While some criticize the delay yet another study would have caused, I believe that without additional nonbiased science to base a decision on, the politicizing of this issue could put a legislative solution at least a year down the road, and possibly more.

Many felt we reached a good compromise on wetlands when we drafted the swampbuster provisions in the 1985 farm bill. The established procedures for implementing swampbuster were specifically designed to apply to wetlands on agricultural lands, and were accepted widely by farmers. conservationists, the administration, and Congress. I supported this effort, and am very disappointed by the administration's decision to change the regulations on this program. In contacts with Idaho farmers, the Soil Conservation Service, the Idaho Department of Fish and Game, and others in our State, there is strong agreement that this program has been successful and generated very little controversy.

Last year I supported funding for the water quality incentives and wetlands reserve programs. I believe these programs and others like them will help America's farmers make significant strides toward resource conservation during the next decade. The alternative could be a regulatory approach which would be difficult to understand and possibly counterproductive for both America's farmers and the environment.

Idaho, like other arid Western States, has already lost the majority of its historic wet-

lands. Yet they provide significant benefits to the people and economy of this State. Wetlands in Idaho reduce runoff siltation and pollution into our waterways by holding back floodwater. They help in holding water from snow melt, which provides groundwater recharge benefits for fish, wildlife, native vegetation, and farming.

Mr. Speaker, I remain optimistic that we can work together to reach a sensible framework to identify and delineate wetlands in this country. The 1985 farm bill shows that it is possible.

THE TWISTED POLITICS OF TRADE

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues the following article, "The Twisted Politics of Trade." Authored by Robert J. Samuelson, the piece gives, in my view, an accurate analysis of the trade issue.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 22, 1992]

THE TWISTED POLITICS OF TRADE

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Politics and economics have rarely been so much at odds as they are now on trade. Everyone's preaching economic nationalism. "America First," says Pat Buchanan. "Jobs, jobs, jobs," said President Bush of his recent trip to Japan. We must guard "our goal" (a hockey analogy), warns Sen. Bob Kerrey. If we practice what these guys preach, we may ultimately harm our economy's strongest sector; exports.

Contrary to popular belief, America is not an export weakling. Since 1985, our exports have nearly doubled from $219 billion to an estimated $422 billion in 1991. (December figures aren't yet in.) We may now be the world's largest exporter. In 1990, Germany was top with 12.1 percent of the global total. We were second (11.6 percent), and Japan was third (8.5 percent). However, our exports rose in 1991, and Germany's fell. We shouldn't now give other countries an excuse to block our exports by embracing protectionism or "managed trade."

Our politicians are doing just that. President Bush mouths the rehetroic of fair trade and drifts toward managed trade. In Tokyo, he correctly pushed Japan to change practices that discriminate against imports. For example, Japan imports only 4 percent of its paper even though it is a high-cost producer. But Bush went too far in seeking special trade deals for U.S. industry. Pressuring Japan to buy 20,000 U.S. cars or $10 billion of auto parts is managed trade that could easily backfire.

To see why, consider a more extreme scheme backed by House Majority Leader Richard Gephardt. He proposes legislation that would require Japan to eliminate its trade surplus with the United Sates over five years. Otherwise, we would impose sharp cuts in Japanese car imports.

Great. The United States now has an estimated $17 billion trade surplus with the European Community. Does Gephardt naively think that the Europeans wouldn't demand the same of us? Of course they would. World trade cannot flourish on the basis of mandated trade balances between individual countries. Trade prompts countries to specialize in what they do best. In turn, specialization makes it hard to balance the trade between two countries. Suppose Country A sells gizmos to Country B and buys widgets from Country C. Even if its total trade is balanced, it may have a surplus with Country B and a deficit with Country C.

What Gephardt endorses is pure protectionism. If adopted, it would reduce trade and everyone's economic growth. Managed trade involves similar, through subtler, dangers. It would set trade goals in individual industries by diplomacy. We delude ourselves if we think we could perpetually extract concessions from other countries without giving anything in return. Sooner or later, we would face pressures to limit our exports in exchange for other countries' limits. This is senseless policy of penalizing our strong industries and rewarding our weak industries.

But the popular appeal of these approaches is increasing, because many Americans believe two myths. The first is that our trade deficit has contributed to the recession and weak economy. Quite the opposite: sharp declines in the deficit (from a peak of $152 billion in 1987 to $102 billion in 1990 to about $65 billion in 1991) have been a stimulus to the economy. Unfortunately, it hasn't been enough to offset fully the drag of lackluster consumer spending.

The second myth is that the United States is fundamentally "uncompetitive." Not so. In the 1980s, two things happened. First, intense foreign competition forced U.S. companies to become more efficient. Manufacturing productivity rose at a 3.5 percent annual rate: the best gains since the early 1950s. Second, the dollar's exchange rate declined sharply from its artificially high levels of the early 1980s. These changes have made many U.S. industries low-cost producers.

Their health is obscured by the troubles of the American auto industry. Its immediate problems stem mostly from the weak economy and poor sales. But the Big Three would like to cure their slump by forcing—through legislation or a diplomatic deal—Japanese carmakers to cut U.S. sales. Other manufacturers are worried they'll suffer from this protectionism. Listen to what Dexter Baker—head of the National Association of Manufacturers and chief executive of a chemical company—said recently at a press conference. In effect, he told the automakers to get lost.

Q. Congress is considering a variety of legislation, particularly in the field of auto imports. Are you going to oppose [these bills]?

A. You bet.

Q. That's bad for the rest of American manufacturing?

A. Absolutely. Absolutely.

Q. And you will be arguing with the Big Three automakers and others?

A. Well, they're important members of our organization, but we don't think protectionism is the way to go.

With luck, our trade deficit could disappear by 1995, argues Stephen Cooney of the NAM. We should be working urgently to expand free trade, because we are in a great position to benefit. Instead of begging for special treatment, President Bush should have pushed Japan to make concessions in global trade negotiations (the Uruguay Round). Unfortunately, he merely gave lip service to the trade talks. These may fail, because both Europe and Japan are clinging to protectionism for farm products.

All Americans favor America first. But a slogan is not a policy. An open trading system serves our interests. In the 1980s, the U.S. economy was powered heavily by a consumer buying boom, which was one reason for our huge imports. Now, consumer spending has slowed. Exports and related investments are engines of growth. If protectionism rhetoric inspires protectionism policies, Americans will be among the first victims.

HONORING MR. YOSHIO C. NAKAMURA ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT FROM RIO HONDO COMMUNITY COLLEGE

HON. ESTEBAN EDWARD TORRES

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a special individual, Mr. Yoshio C. Nakamura. Mr. Nakamura is retiring from public service work after 29 years of employment at Rio Hondo Community College, and will be honored at a special retirement dinner on January 29, 1992.

Mr. Nakamura received his bachelor of fine arts and master of fine arts degrees from the University of Southern California. He has studied at Stanford University, UCLA, UC Riverside, Whittier College, and the Otis Art Institute.

Mr. Nakamura began his career as a teacher with the Whittier School District. In 1963 he joined the staff of Rio Hondo College as a professor of art and served in that capacity until 1973. He served as dean of community services from 1973–1983; dean of community and student services from 1983–1985; vice president of community and student services from 1985–1991, and vice president of community service and institutional development from 1990 to present.

As a staff sergeant in the United States Army, 442d Regimental Combat Team/Japanese-American Unit, he was decorated with the Bronze Star, Presidential Unit Citation with oak leaf cluster, and European Theater Ribbon with three battle stars.

He has published numerous articles on a variety of subjects, ranging from teaching guides for use at all levels of educational services, to a "how to manual" for helping community college trustees utilize community services.

During my tenure in Congress, Mr. Nakamura has been instrumental in assisting me with the preparation of my annual business expo conference. He has dedicated countless hours to working on my business expos and his personal touch has been appreciated by the thousands of individuals who have attended throughout the years. Indeed, because of Mr. Nakamura's efforts, my business expos have always been resounding successes.

Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1992, administrators, former students, civil leaders and dear friends will be gathered to honor Mr. Yoshio Nakamura for his tremendous and unselfish contributions to the field of education and to our community. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting this exceptional man for his outstanding record of educational service to the young people of my district and the State of California.

KAY PARDEE, DADE SUPER TEACHER

HON. ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, every school district has those teachers who stand out and Ms. Kay Pardee is one of those teachers. Her devotion to her students speaks for itself. She presently devotes herself to teaching the third grade at Pinecrest Elementary School. The Miami Herald recently recognized her as one of Dade County's super teachers in a recent article by staff writer, Jon O'Neill. That article follows:

Kay Pardee wants her students to love learning as much as she loves teaching. And that's a lot.

Pardee, 43, has been working at Pinecrest Elementary for almost 23 years, yet every day is a new adventure. She is filled with ideas designed to make learning fun while at the same time pushing her kids to their academic limits.

"Her classroom is a magic place," said Pardee's boss, principal Bonnie Wheatley. "She is a premier teacher who has retained her enthusiasm and interest. There's no burnout as far as she is concerned."

"I love doing this," said Pardee, who teaches third grade. "It's the only job where you get a daily payoff watching the faces of your students. It's never the same, there are no ruts."

Pardee makes sure of that. Monday, she gave her math class a break from the routine by having them play the card game "War"—with a twist. Each student drew two cards, then multiplied their face values. The kid with the highest total got to keep the cards.

When the class read the book that inspired the TV show Little House on the Prairie, they made models of the house and churned their own butter. When they study anatomy, they make life-size paper bodies to work with.

The kids love it.

"She's nice and she makes things interesting," said David Thornton, 8. "When we did book reports, we made boxes with drawings on the outside and a clue on the inside. Then everybody had to guess what book we read. It's fun."

For discipline, Pardee uses buttons labeled ICMM for "I Can Manage Myself." When kids misbehave, they lose the buttons. If they keep them all week or all term, they get rewards like stickers or boxes of raisins.

"I think it makes them responsible for their own behavior," Pardee said. "I want to help them build their own self-esteem and let them know they can decide how well they can do."

Student Elke Van Breemen, 9, has never lost her ICMM button. That's because she enjoys her class and her teacher.

"She's very kind and she always helps you," Elke said. "She makes you do a lot of work, but in a nice way. She never shouts at you."

Pardee has had a lot of time to develop her teaching style. Born in Upland, Calif., she moved to Miami when she was 4. As a child, she used to play teacher with her sisters, right down to giving them homework. By the time she was a senior at Coral Gables High, Pardee was sure she wanted to be a teacher.

She got a bachelor's degree in education at the University of Miami, then got a master's in reading there. She started at Pinecrest, 10250 SW 57th Ave., in 1969 and—except for a two-year stint as a reading specialist—has been there ever since.

She has seen a lot of students during the past two decades, and sometimes the biggest thrill is seeing them again.

"I had a former student come in one time and tell me she was starting to intern as a teacher," Pardee said. "Then she said: 'It's because of you that I decided to go into teaching.' You can't get much more of a reward than that."

Mr. Speaker, I commend Kay Pardee for her contribution to teaching in south Florida. She is a model educator. I commend the leadership of principal Bonnie M. Wheatley and vice principal Lamonte Haynes for making Pinecrest Elementary School a place where teachers like Kay Pardee can thrive.

A THOUGHTFUL SUGGESTION FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, during the recess I spent some time with an old friend and colleague, Chuck Chamberlain, a fellow Michigander and former member of the House.

Chuck mentioned an article he had seen, written by Norman Ornstein, a resident scholar at the American Enterprise Institute. The article put forth what I feel is a fine idea for reforming one area of congressional rules, and a very controversial area at that.

Mr. Ornstein's suggestion is to change the ethics committees of both Houses of Congress "to consist of former members and staff, appointed by leaders for fixed terms."

This suggestion has at least two virtues: One, by appointing "outsiders" it eliminates a conflict, or at least a perceived conflict of interest in the deliberations of the Ethics Committees; two, by appointing those who have served in Congress, Members who are called before the Ethics Committees can be assured that their cases are being heard by people who have more than a superficial understanding of their plight.

Service on the Ethics Committees is perhaps one of the most difficult assignments a Member can have. I am sure that the many fine Members who are currently serving on these committees would welcome this change.

As Mr. Ornstein puts it:

The lawmakers who now serve on the ethics panels—including some of the best, most honorable and most conscientious we have—would be freed from that thankless and onerous task and able to spend much more time on productive policy pursuits.

There are many thoughtful and civic-minded former members who would like a chance to serve their Nation once again.

I believe this suggestion merits serious consideration by my colleagues and ask that the column by Norman Ornstein be reprinted in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 28, 1991]

LET FORMER CONGRESSMEN JUDGE

(By Norman Ornstein)

The Senate Ethics Committee's reprimand of Senator Alan Cranston puts a painful and rather bizarre end to the saga of the Keating Five. But it does not end the dilemma the Senate—and the House—face while dealing with investigation and punishment of violations of congressional ethics. No matter what they do, they get criticized and vilified. The verdicts are either too easy, reflecting the desire of members to protect their own, no matter how egregious the conduct, or too tough, reflecting partisan, personality or ideological motives to "get" the miscreant.

We have had more than our share of highly publicized examples in the past few years, from Gus Savage, Jim Bates, "Buz" Lukens and Speaker Jim Wright in the House to the Keating Five and Sens. Durenberger and D'Amato in the Senate. Currently, we have the investigations into leaks in the Senate, and the sergeant-at-arms bank in the House. We don't know what will come next, but most assuredly something, and someone, will emerge before long. Each time, the House or Senate Ethics Committee, or a related designated group, investigates and deliberates, surrounded by an atmosphere of suspicion and skepticism. No wonder finding members to serve on the ethics panels is about as easy as recruiting vacationers to Beirut.

The problem starts with the fact that the congressional ethics committees have a built-in conflict of interest. When colleagues investigate, judge, prosecute and punish each other, there will always be suspicion about their actions. The judges, after all, are peers and friends (or rivals) of the judged. They are together with them daily, often on an intimate basis and in an interdependent fashion. The outcomes of their actions do more than affect the accused: They can shape the judges' own careers and policy or political preferences. That inherent conflict is precisely why Congress passed the "Special Prosecutor" law for the executive branch—to avoid the taint that would come from executive officials investigating allegations of wrongdoing by one of their own.

In particularly touchy and controversial situations, the two congressional ethics committees have tried to resolve this ethics dilemma by taking on an independent investigator, like Richard Phelan in the Jim Wright case and Robert Bennett for the Keating Five. That has not worked well. Special counsels may have ambitions and political motives of their own, as Phelan demonstrated, or may find, as Bennett did, that their work does not prevent the ethics committees from dividing politically or being accused of the same old conflicts of interests.

The solution for Congress is not to create special prosecutors for itself; that would not be appropriate under the Constitution, which gives Congress, in Article I, Section V, the responsibility to police the conduct of its own. Neither would it be suitable to create ethics committees consisting of those who are removed from Congress and who do not understand the nature and working of an inherently political body.

There is a way out, however, that strikes the right balance: Change the Senate and House ethics committees to consist of former members (and staff) appointed by leaders for fixed terms. Former lawmakers understand Congress and its members but are removed from the conflict of interest that comes with judging one's contemporary colleagues.

Many former members, to be sure, have their own conflicts of interest, including those who lobby Congress or otherwise do business directly with it. But we have available loads of others, including some of the most impressive and experienced citizens in

the country, who run businesses, practice law, write, teach or engage in other productive pursuits. Who among us could exceed the integrity, patriotism, sensitivity and credibility of people like Edmund Muskie, Howard Baker, James Pearson and Charles McC. Mathias from the Senate, or Barber Conable, John Y. McCollister, Bill Brodhead and John Brademas from the House? There are dozens of others who would be just as appropriate. The same is true of high-quality former members of the staff; the ethics committees also have responsibility for overseeing and policing the conduct of staffers.

If we have ethics panels made up of former legislators and staffers, they could consider any charges or complaints of wrongdoing or misconduct by lawmakers or employees, investigating and adjudicating them, then making recommendations to the appropriate house of Congress for the final judgment it is required to make under the Constitution.

Lawmakers wouldn't have to worry about losing control; it would be their most respected and esteemed former colleagues, free from their own political ambitions or self-interest, making judgments. Outsiders might criticize their verdicts but could not make any charges stick that it was the foxes guarding the chicken coops (or the chickens judging the foxes). The lawmakers who now serve on the ethics panels—including some of the best, most honorable and most conscientious we have—would be freed from that thankless and onerous task and able to spend much more time on productive policy pursuits. And at least one area where Congress is regularly pilloried could be removed from the list.

THE POWERFUL WORDS OF SAMUEL J. LEFRAK

HON. STEPHEN J. SOLARZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. SOLARZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a friend, a proud New Yorker, a distinguished leader of the business community, and a dedicated public servant, Dr. Samuel J. LeFrak.

Dr. LeFrak is chairman of the LeFrak Organization, one of the world's leading building firms. In New York, such landmarks as LeFrak City, Battery Park City, and Kings Bay Housing stand as monuments to his professional success. Yet his contributions to our city and our Nation extend far beyond his corporate endeavors.

Dr. LeFrak is a leading advocate for the homeless. He is also the sponsor of a scholarship program that sends gifted New York children to participate in the yearly American Academy of Achievement Program which brings talented youngsters together with prominent Americans. At last year's academy meeting, Dr. LeFrak was given the honor of presenting the keynote address at the United Nations. His speech, while directed at the 500 high school honorees in the audience, has a powerful message for all of us. I commend Dr. LeFrak's words to my colleagues.

ACCEPTING THE CHALLENGE OF A CHANGING WORLD

(By Samuel J. LeFrak)

Ladies and gentlemen, distinguished guests.

Cicero once said: "I approve of a youth who has something of the old man in him. *** as I approve of the old man who has something of the youth in him. He who follows this rule may be old in body but can never be old in mind."

Welcome and congratulations to all of you honorees and over-achievers here today: past and present *** young and old *** in mind and body.

You deserve the world's applause and recognition for what you have achieved and for what you will be achieving.

The hallowed halls of this great building are most appropriate for today's meeting because this is a sacred place. Alone among the institutions of international politics, the United Nations is the preeminent forum where words—not guns—are the weapons of choice for settling disputes and avoiding war.

One of the greatest strengths of our democracy is that we can, on occasion, act like a community. We can become a group, sharing its strengths to overcome our weakness, a group accepting diversity as a precious source of creativity and using conformity as a ladder for communication. It is always reassuring to have a visible manifestation of this idealistic concept. Thus, I predict that we are on the threshold of the Golden Age of the United Nations.

Indeed, all of us here today who experienced the glory and victory of Operation Desert Storm also witnessed the global cooperation which brought about the downfall of an aggressor state.

Through rapid communications, high technology, and reason, a relentless and immediate focus on Saddam Hussein's madness rallied the world behind the United States and leaders like President George Bush and U.N. Ambassador Thomas Pickering.

Truly, the "Global Village" is a reality; and the microcosm of this volatile reality is here at the United Nations. We are one world! One people!

It was for just such purposes that this complex of buildings and its altruistic doctrines were created forty years ago: to study, evaluate, and respond quickly to world strife with practical solutions.

Today, as we approach the 21st century, the scope of changes taking place compels us to resolve international issues at an even faster pace than before.

Instant TV replay of shattering events like Tienamin Square and the Kurdish disaster are immediate reflections of global problems that must be solved at once.

My remarks today, therefore, will be addressed to you: the next generation of young, bold leaders who must yet confront and unravel the monumental conflicts that have plagued mankind throughout the modern era *** a generation that must reshape the future of the world as we enter a new millennium.

And I must say that I am happy to be here to speak to such an outstanding group of overachievers.

For you are not a lost generation! Or a silent generation! Or an indifferent generation! You are a concerned and committed generation. And I, for one, believe adult America should be proud and thankful that you, young America—youthful America—is concerned for our country, dedicated to genuine understanding of world problems and fearless in your determination to be a part of the solutions we seek.

Never before has youth been so informed, assertive, articulate and well educated. Poetry and art, philosophy and science, religion, politics, economics, and the environment will be affected by you. It is you who must eventually cure cancer, homelessness, AIDS, and the common cold, lay out blight-proof and smog-free cities, enrich the underdeveloped world, and write "the end" to poverty and war.

As we stand on the threshold of the Twenty-first Century, our ability to survive and flourish as a civilization will depend upon your enthusiasm, creativity and hard work. For you are the future explorers, scientists, artists, inventors, and innovators who must change the way we live. Many of you someday may even return here to the United Nations to represent our great country as its diplomats and world statesmen.

For it is your generation that will be called upon to correct the effects of this vast explosion of technology, rapid communication, and knowledge *** to satisfy our growing needs for education, health, culture, and improved living conditions. Your mission, therefore, is to accept the challenge of a swiftly changing world.

No other generation of Americans has ever had so great an opportunity and so great a responsibility.

Chekhov said we live today to improve tomorrow. Albert Einstein summed up the challenge. He said the most incomprehensible thing about the world is that it is comprehensive.

Any attempt to understand international relations today therefore must begin by considering the speed with which the modern world has been unmoored from its own past. An exuberant new vitality has stirred the human species, altering patterns of life set in the daybreak of civilization. Moved by ideals of individual dignity and worth, millions of people in countries around the world have questioned and changed age-old hierarchies of power and influence. Empires have disappeared, new nations have been born. There is today the technical paucity to do down with poverty, disease and homelessness.

A wise man once wrote: "The worst sin toward our fellow creatures is not to hate them but to be indifferent to them." Indifference can no longer be tolerated. Throughout history there has been no better time than now to correct the world's inequities.

Only one choice faces us. And that is to act! The 80-year old Voltaire, when told that a tree he favored would take 40 years to bloom, said to his gardener, "Well, then, plant it this afternoon."

As we look to the next century, shortages, poverty, upheavals, environmental disasters seem all too possible. How can we survive, much less prosper, in a complex and turbulent world?

We should remember that the Chinese ideograph for "crisis" is composed of two picture-characters: one means "danger" and the other means "opportunity."

I stress the significance of the word "crisis." For each disappointment, each disaster, each crisis offers us a window of opportunity to advance science and culture, to extend human kindness and caring to others less fortunate...to keep bright the torch of reason and concern in a world too often dark with despair and doubt.

More than 125 years ago, a group of French painters decided to break from the artistic traditions they inherited. These rebels became known as the Impressionists. From the beginning, critics denounced them as if they were attacking the very basis of French life, instead of merely trying to capture the effects of light as they saw it.

It took twenty years for their works to become popular, and, by that time, the movement had come to an end . . . but not without having achieved a permanent and honored place in world history.

Seventy-five years ago new ideas were being broached and old frontiers were being breached in music, literature, and science. Debussy was paving the way for the sounds of 20th Century music and audiences more than once broke up concerts with noisy demonstrations and riots. Men like James Joyce and T.S. Eliot were bringing a new realism to fiction and poetry in a society that had grown all too satisfied with the old ways of viewing the world. In physics, Ernest Rutherford was beginning to unlock the secrets of the atom. And soon afterward, Sigmund Freud would open new windows on the inner conflicts of man.

In short, this period was much like our own, but with one significant difference—and this difference has a vital bearing on you young people gathered here today. For you, the intellectual vanguard of your generation, are the Impressionists of today.

Recall for a moment the work of one distinguished innovator born more than 300 years ago: Galileo. In a dramatic demonstration, Galileo climbed to the top of the leaning Tower of Pisa and dropped objects of varying weights to the ground to prove that the mass of an object had no effect on its velocity under free-fall conditions.

Yet for two thousand years, man had believed the reverse because Aristotle, the great Greek philosopher, had said so! Before Galileo, no one had asked for proof or sought to disprove Aristotle's theory.

Today, we are moving through a period of splendid hope. We are on the verge of a Second Age of Enlightenment. New horizons, new challenges, new opportunities abound. Your commitment to balancing business needs with environmental concerns, in seeing that higher education addresses real-world issues and problems, and in attempting new forms of artistic and social expression, represent democratic areas where truth and absolute freedom exist with no holds barred.

You seek to bring new flavor into our lives. You ask to be directed and guided in a manner that will not turn you into carbon copies of previous generations, for you are tomorrow's leaders. Yet, the proliferation of knowledge required today by our highly technical society demands that you think fast, run fast, write fast, and act fast.

You are a generation of Galileos poking holes in the Aristotles of the older generation. However, you face difficulties Galileo did not encounter, for, after all, no one's life then depended upon relative velocities of falling objects. In a sense, mankind could afford to wait two thousand years for Galileo.

However, today's world being what it is, we cannot afford to wait 2,000 or 500 or even 50 years for answers to problems facing our society. This urgency will create added burdens and tensions. But you cannot let this deter you from your intended course.

Moreover, do not expect to have only one crucial confrontation with truth as Galileo did. Your problems will not lend themselves to simple solutions. You will have to take that lonely walk up hundreds of towers; and even then the results will often create contradiction and uncertainty.

Consider for a moment the radical and turbulent changes you have lived through in just a few short years.

We've seen man land on the moon; the Berlin Wall torn down; the winds of change blowing throughout the world; Russia forsaking Communism and moving toward the West; peace talks abound; China evolving toward a market economy.

We saw the United Nations band together to destroy an unjust and cowardly enemy threatening world peace. We saw American forces in a desert war use modern technology to defeat an enemy within a relatively short period of time. We hailed a dauntless General Norman Schwarzkopf. And applauded a brilliant general staff under the command of General Colin Powell. Victory brought us together. Made us proud. Gave us strength and hope. Yes, even the "flag-burners" were denounced! And a tremendous swell of American patriotism was reborn!

Now a new world order faces us today. New dreams. New aspirations. New challenges. The international community seeks our help, guidance, direction, and cooperation.

And with whom does all this new hope and promise reside?

With you . . . America's greatest resource: its young, bright leaders and scholars.

No one knows, no one can be sure, what great talent lies within you. The reinforcement and nourishment you derive from the academic world is only the foundation upon which you must build the superstructure of your future lives.

Historically, our past generations have depended upon hard work and resourcefulness. It was this resourcefulness that helped our forefathers develop America. Their ingenuity and enterprise enabled our people to enjoy those luxuries we now take for granted.

The entire world is now looking for your help, your resourcefulness, your ingenuity, and for this reason you must be ready to lead.

For better or for worse, the world today is committed to accelerating change—radical, wrenching, erosive of both traditions and old values. You, its inheritors, have grown up with rapid change and are better prepared to accommodate this change than any young men and women in history.

With your skeptical, yet humanistic outlook, your disdain for fanaticism, and your scorn for the superficial, you will infuse the future with a new sense of morality, a contemporary ethical concept that will further enrich our society and keep our great nation paramount in the eyes of the world.

Mark Twain once said to another group of overachievers: "You have won your places, not by heredities, and not by family influence or extraneous help, but by the natural gifts that God gave you at your birth, made effective by your very own energies."

So, remember this well—your energies and abilities have brought you this far. It is even more important that you rely on these same energies and abilities from this point on! Each of you can make something of yourselves because by your very presence here today you have proven that you have within yourselves the ability, the desire, and aspirations to reach for the stars.

But now the responsibility is yours. You have demanded it. It is up to you to know all. It is up to you to dare all.

Tomorrow's challenges are the greatest reason for your existence. You are the hope for our future.

God Bless You . . . and God Bless our Wonderful Country!

Thank you.

DIFFERENT CENTURY RULERS SET SIMILAR REFORMS IN MOTION

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the very able and much published Marine Gen. James D. Hittle, retired, has written an interesting piece in the January 27 Navy Times. I submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The analogy he draws between today and the Russian events of a century and more ago is startling to say the least.

[From the Navy Times, Jan. 27, 1992]

DIFFERENT CENTURY RULERS SET SIMILAR REFORMS IN MOTION

(By Brig. Gen. James D. Hittle)

Alexander II is known as the "Czar Liberator." So far, Mikhail Gorbachev is not called "Communist Liberator" but it could take only the passage of time for his policies to be seen in clearer perspective. Just as Alexander II received his well-deserved nickname, Gorbachev, for his historic contributions, deserves recognition for the forces he set in motion.

Alexander II (1818–1881) and Gorbachev lived in different centuries and under different political systems. Yet, whatever their respective motives, through both of their periods of power run some basic similarities.

Each came to power inheriting accumulated problems of their predecessors. Alexander, when he became czar in 1855, found himself ruling a vast nation wallowing in an economic and political quagmire of serfdom that was virtually a form of slavery, outmoded political methods, censorship and an economic system unprepared for the industrial revolution. Moreover, Russia was being financially drained by the Crimean War. Alexander, like Gorbachev in his time, faced the unpleasant choice of accepting and continuing the policies of the Russia he inherited or facing up to the harsh reality of what was going on.

The Crimean War basically was a conflict between Russia and the Western powers—England and France—aligned with Russia's old antagonist, Turkey. In this sense, there were basic parallels between the Crimean War and Gorbachev's Cold War.

What Alexander II did regarding the Crimean War and what Gorbachev did regarding the Cold War underlines the realism of both. Alexander II accepted the Western peace terms, thus, in effect, surrendering. Gorbachev, about a century later, threw in the towel, too, ending a potentially explosive, and extremely expensive, confrontation with the West.

Another intriguing parallel is how, after the end of the Crimean War and again following the Cold War, Russia reopened the window to the West.

There followed, under Alexander's rule, revitalization of a previously moribund railway system, expansion of banking and hospitals and extensive improvements in education. Western technology, then as now, was to play a major role in the transformation of Russia.

But perhaps it was the kind of reform policies that Alexander II and later Gorbachev initiated that so clearly marked the changes they were bringing about.

Alexander, in 1861, liberated the millions of serfs. His objective was to provide them with

shelter and fields to till. To do this required some breaking up of the huge land holdings. Gorbachev, in the next century, sought to stimulate agriculture by providing rented land to the individual farmer, largely at the expense of the collective farm system. In each of these instances, Alexander's and Gorbachev's policies were only partially successful. It was the land-owning nobles and gentry who opposed and partially blocked Alexander's efforts. Gorbachev's opposition was the entrenched bureaucracy whose authority and privileges are largely based on the collective system.

Both rulers initiated farsighted changes in the lives of the Russian people. Alexander stopped the heavy restrictions on religious activities. Gorbachev started opening the churches. Also, under each, censorship was relaxed. Alexander put an end to special taxes levied on the Jews. Gorbachev permitted the emigration of Jews.

On military personnel matters there is another striking parallel between what happened under the czar and the communist leaders. After both the Crimean and the Cold War there were heavy cuts in Russian military forces, with widespread termination of military careers and resulting dissatisfaction and dissension.

The relaxation of censorship under Alexander fostered political discussion and the growth of political journalism. Later, under the communists, journalism was rigidly controlled, and opposing political discussion forbidden. Gorbachev returned the country to a policy of openness, providing freedom to speak and write, even critically, about government policy.

The parallels of their respective rules extended even to their removal from power. Alexander was killed by a bomb thrown by a disgruntled student. Gorbachev's authority really ended with the brief, but futile coup. From the moment of his capture and the three—day loss of the nuclear control "black box," his power went into a tailspin.

As historical figures, both Alexander II and Mikhail Gorbachev stand tall in their respective centuries and in their roles affecting not only Russia but world events. Each in his time initiated transitions of epic proportions. Alexander II started the transition of the Russian empire from a semi-feudal to an early industrial and capitalist nation. Gorbachev set in motion vast forces that ended the Cold War, broke down the Berlin Wall, freed Eastern Europe and brought down the communistic Soviet Union. And, as so often happens, those whose reforms are the engines of transitions do not end up under happy circumstances. Both Alexander and Gorbachev paid a high price for their glasnost and perestroika.

In the end both were victims of their own liberalizing policies. Mikhail Gorbachev, now in eclipse and discard, must occasionally remember what Alexander II once said to his friend Prince von Bismarck: "It was never possible to stop liberal developments at the right time."

TRIBUTE TO WARREN BROOKES

HON. LAMAR S. SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, clarity is a valued commodity in our world that often seems clouded by confusion. Warren Brookes helped us navigate through that cloud. He passed away in December, and we will all miss the lucid reasoning he brought to our world.

Warren stood out among his colleagues. Not tossed about by the political storms that rage in our Capital, he was anchored by his beliefs. Those beliefs led him toward the truth as he saw it.

Mr. Speaker, the following article from the Washington Times is a fitting tribute to Warren that I wanted to share with my colleagues:

WARREN BROOKES

The story goes that the popular CBS news program "60 Minutes" was looking to do a story on Warren Brookes, whose reporting was making life miserable for those who argue that more government can cure everything from acid rain to hair loss. In a town where journalistic success is measured by TV appearances, a lot of reporters would have welcomed the national spotlight. Not Mr. Brookes, not the man known to many here simply as "Warren."

Instead, the columnist encouraged the show's producers to take a closer look at the government's idea of acid-rain clean-up. The show took his advice, and what followed was a prime-time reminder of what the columnist had long argued: The Clean Air Act wasn't really going to clean up very much, but the economy would pay an enormous price. So it has, and so it will.

Well, the environmental president and his handpicked choice to run the Environmental Protection Agency, William Reilly, can breathe a little easier now knowing that they don't have Warren to kick their programs around any more. He died suddenly, unexpectedly last week after a brief illness. He leaves behind many friends at The Washington Times, where his column appeared, and a legacy of puncturing this city's conventional wisdom.

Unlike a lot of reporters in Washington, Warren actually crunched some of the numbers spewing out of the federal government. When they didn't add up, he dared to say so. He showed that Washington's beloved fuel-economy standards were killers, but that apples were not. He threw cold water on global warming. He made clear just how taxing taxes could be. He let the air out of the so-called Massachusetts Miracle.

He also followed the facts where they led him. If that meant breaking ranks with conservatives and saying something nice about Rep. John Dingell—say, on the allegations of scientific fraud involving Rockefeller University President David Baltimore—he would. But no dumb idea was safe. Following news of his death, Mr. Dingell released a statement praising the columnist's analysis and writing. "We didn't always see eye to eye," he said, "but I always received fair treatment at his hand, and I regarded him as a friend. I hope God is good to him." A spokesman for the congressman added that Warren was more interested in ideas than personalities: "It was never personal with him." From Vice President Quayle, whom Warren visited over Christmas, came this praise: "He was a wonderful person, a great reporter and a dear friend. I will miss him."

The columnist's success was based on more than hard work. It started from an almost religious premise that Washington's materialistic outlook on life made it incapable of understanding the people it was supposed to govern. Government measures well-being in terms of quarterly GNP figures. Warren measured it in terms of energy, imagination and faith. Where Washington saw limits, scarcity and death, Warren saw a limitless God in whom all things—even life everlasting—were possible. From a few loaves and fishes could come not just progress but miracles. In his 1982 book. "The Economy in Mind," which is excerpted today in the space opposite, he quoted Pope John Paul II: "Whatever the miseries or suffering that afflict man, it is not through violence, the interplay of power and political systems, but through the truth concerning man, that he journeys toward a better future." (His emphasis.) Christ Jesus himself rejected the finite material world, wrote Warren, when he said, "In the world ye have tribulation, but be of good cheer; I have overcome the world."

Unfortunately, Warren, added, some people have taken to worshipping a different god—a god of entropy, of finitude, of limits. This new religion, he said, "must accept all of the unspiritual premises these limits imply, from environmental extremism to zero population growth, from abortion to the 'right to die.'"

His own unshakable faith made Warren skeptical of the limits implicit in environmentalism, protectionism, anti-immigration fervor and in so much of what passes for policy in Washington. It made him a great reporter—much as it would embarrass him to hear this—who will be much missed. Washington has lost a journalist, The Times a good friend and the nation that rare public servant. But Warren's ideas live on, confirming his belief in how few limits in life there really are.

SIU-CREWED TUGS SAVE SIX FOUNDERING ON VIOLENT LAKE ERIE

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, in these times of daily accounts of personal failings, it is with great pride that I rise today to share with you the personal heroics of several Greater Clevelanders, all seamen and all members of the Seafarers International Union. They risked personal injury and possible death to save the lives of their fellow seamen late last year on the stormed-tossed waters of Lake Erie.

Unfortunately, the American worker has been the object of scorn and ridicule in recent weeks. I am proud to say that the selfless efforts of the men profiled here typify the work ethic which has helped to make the Greater Cleveland area the proud community it is today. The account of their brave efforts is contained in the following story which was written for a future issue of Seafarers Log, the official publication of the Seafarers International Union.

SIU-CREWED TUGS SAVE SIX FOUNDERING ON VIOLENT LAKE ERIE

The SIU-crewed tugboat Wisconsin completed a daring rescue of six boatmen drifting on a tugboat and barge on choppy Lake Erie minutes before nightfall.

Around 2:30 p.m. on December 14, the dispatcher at the Great Lakes Towing office in Cleveland received a distress call from a non-union tugboat, the Paddy Miles, towing the barge loaded with a crane. A second tug, the

Hamm Thomas, also pulling the barge from Rocky River—less than 10 miles west of Cleveland—sunk shortly after entering Lake Erie. Its two-man crew safely scrambled aboard the barge.

Deckhand/Engineer Ed Fike was at home when he received a call to report to the 90-foot Wisconsin. "I asked myself what I was going out for," the 31-year SIU member told a reporter for the Seafarers Log. Weather conditions included 10 to 12-foot seas, 35-mile-per-hour winds gusting as high as 60 and temperatures dropping to 30 degrees.

"Then I heard people needed rescued and I changed my mind immediately," Fike recalled.

The 48-foot Miles had lost all power and its tow line when it called for help. Both the tug and barge were drifting to the east. News reports noted the only available Coast Guard rescue vessel, a 41-footer, was not rated for seas higher than eight feet.

When the Wisconsin caught up with the barge, it was 1.5 miles east of the mouth of the Cuyahoga River in downtown Cleveland.

"We made a pass for the rig and got a line on it," Fike said.

Because of the high seas and icy conditions, the cable slipped off the cleat.

"We re-rigged a line and went after it again. Considering the heavy seas, everything went really well," the deckhand added. One of the four men on the deck of the Miles caught the line and secured it for towing. The Wisconsin pulled the barge within the Cleveland breakwall where the Idaho, another SIU-crewed Great Lakes Towing vessel, was waiting. The Wisconsin returned to the lake to save the Miles.

"It was getting close to dark," Fike remembered. "We didn't have much time left." The Miles had drifted within 1,000 feet of the breakwall and was headed for it. The Wisconsin pulled alongside the smaller tug and secured a tow line on the first try.

The whole rescue took approximately two hours. Fike said he talked briefly with those who were rescued, but "it was so cold and we were so wet, all we wanted to do was get warm and dry." However, one of those saved by the Great Lakes Towing tugs remembered them with a Christmas card. It read:

To the Heroes: Thank you for coming to the rescue in a life-threatening situation. Your determination and professionalism will not be forgotten. (signed) Russ Maher, Willowick, Ohio.

Other SIU crewmembers involved in the rescue included Deckhands Ray Smith on the Wisconsin and Tim McKenna aboard the Idaho. All three received plaques and letters of commendation from Great Lakes Towing. The company also recommended the trio, as well as the captains and engineers on the Wisconsin and Idaho, for Coast Guard recognition. Finally, the television show "Rescue 911" has contacted the company about doing a story on the rescue.

CULTURAL COLLISION

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as our colleagues may have been aware, Senator HATFIELD and I—on a bipartisan basis—were able to solicit the support and endorsement of our distinguished Members in both the Senate and the House to officially designate the year 1992 as the "Year of the American Indian" (S.J. Res. 217, H.J. Res. 342, Public Law 102–123, signed by the President on December 4, 1991). Although only symbolic, this gesture is important in the eyes of many American Indians because it shows there is sympathy in the eyes of a majority of both Houses of the Congress for those Indian issues we as a Congress have been struggling with for over 200 years. In further explanation of this issue I am providing a recent article from the National Journal for my colleagues' consideration.

CULTURAL COLLISION

The Native American lobby may have found a secret ally in a long-time nemesis. It hopes to share the spotlight in this year's commemoration of the 500th anniversary of Christopher Columbus's historic voyage.

Representatives of Indian tribes have argued aggressively—and with some success—that observations of Columbus's 1492 landing serve as a forum for a reappraisal of the history of Native American cultures and of the status of Indians in contemporary society. The ultimate goal is to parlay the quincentennial hoopla—which will reach a peak on Oct. 12—into pro-Indian social legislation and land policies.

The Native Americans confront a monumental task. Generations of American schoolchildren have been taught that Columbus's arrival opened their country to the advances of European culture and technology. The Indians hope to turn that story on its head; they argue that their ancestors had already established sophisticated civilizations and that Columbus's so-called gifts were devastating: the eventual death of 90 per cent of the indigenous population—as a result of what many Indians regard as genocide—and the institution of slavery.

On the ceremonial front, at least, the Indians have scored a substantial victory. In large measure, 1992 has officially been transformed from the celebration of Europe's discovery of a new world to a commemoration of an encounter between two old worlds.

Some traditionalists call that rewriting history. But Rep. Ben Nighthorse Campbell, D-Colo., a Cheyenne who is the only American Indian in Congress, responds: "Hell, we didn't have a chance to help write it in the first place. We're just trying to set the record straight."

Expanding the record hasn't been easy. Before they could even begin their campaign, Indian leaders had to revise their approach to politics, persuasion and the press. When Congress, in 1984, began to discuss plans for a quincentennial jubilee celebration, the Native American community reacted in traditional fashion: Many Indians ignored it, some protested loudly and largely ineffectually, but most greeted the plans with silent resentment.

"In Indian country, when we don't like something, we stay at home," said Suzan Shown Harjo, a Cheyenne and Hodulgee Muscogee, who is national coordinator of the Washington-based 1992 Alliance, a clearinghouse founded in mid-1990 for Native American responses to the quincentenary. "It took a long while for many of us to really see the pressing need for our involvement in 1992."

Actully, it took about five years. By 1989, however, Indians had begun contacting the planners of quicentennial events to seek recognition of the Native American perspective. State, local and church officials were also asked to lend their support for a more balanced presentation of early American history. And Indians began to plan a variety of alternative events of their own.

Perhaps most important, Native Americans began to cultivate the press. "We learned to play the media game," said Sandra Toineeta a Lakota, who is the American Indian consultant to the New York City-based National Council of Churches and coordinator of the council's 1992-related activities. "It is a media event, so the media had to pick up on it."

CONVERGENCE OF FORCES

It can't be said that the Indians mounted a well-oiled lobbying operation to influence the Columbus commemoration. In fact, they still disagree among themselves over how to proceed this year. Harjo's Alliance, for example is by no means a typical umbrella coalition of like-minded interest groups. The major Native American organizations, such as the National Congress of American Indians in Washington, the Association of American Indian Affairs in New York City and the Boulder (Colo.)-based Native American Rights Foundation, go their separate ways, albeit they all hammer away at basically the same themes.

"I wish I could point to someone who orchestrated this, but there's nobody who can really take credit for it," said La Donna Harris, executive director of Americans for Indian Opportunity in Washington. "There has been no major institutional change [in the country], but rather a new sense of awareness that's come mostly because people like ourselves [in the native American leadership] have said: 'Wait a minute. This really isn't a celebration. You don't have the full story.'"

A combination of outside factors helped the Indians get their message across. Timing was crucial. The nation's changing ethnic makeup, fed by new patterns of immigration, moved issues such as multicultural education to the front burner in the 1980s. Also, the 1960s generation, weaned on a diet of inclusiveness, had come of age and assumed positions of authority in schools, churches and some political offices. Many of them were receptive to the ideas the Indians were pushing.

"Independent ideas coming from many different groups sort of coalesced," said Alicia M. Gonzalez, director of the Smithsonian Institution's office of quincentenary programs.

Other interests clamoring for a place on the quincentennial stage bolstered the Indian's efforts. A major assist, for example, came from Hispanics, a population bloc with its own Columbus-related political agenda and its own claims to indigenous ancestry.

Ironically, Native Americans may have received their biggest boost unintentionally from the Christopher Columbus Quincentenary Jubilee Commission, the official body established by Congress in 1984 to plan a traditional Italian-centered—Columbus Day-parade-writ-large—celebration. Lack of funds, mismanagement and scandal sidetracked the commission, delaying and perhaps precluding lavish preparations for festivities.

The recession has also kept some corporate backers from their checkbooks, as has their fear of investing in projects that could turn out to be controversial because of the stir raised by the Indians.

A lack of consensus among historians has contributed to the debate over how the quincentenary should be commemorated, whether as a glorification of European explorers or a repudiation of rapacious slave

traders. In the main, the federal agencies that have the money to mount major exhibitions and produce television documentaries—the Smithsonian Institution and the Library of Congress, for example—are playing it down the middle by adopting the encounter-of-two-cultures theme.

Predictions vary greatly as to how the year's celebratory events will unfold. In some cases, Native American mourning services will be held simultaneously, or there may be heckling by Indians, like that at some Columbus Day parades last October. Among the major events will be Columbus (Ohio)'s ambitious April–October Ameriflora festival, a horticultural and theatrical exposition budgeted at $53 million. Most such observations are expected, at least minimally, to acknowledge Native Americans in a positive way.

The main hope within Native American circles is that it not be all over when it's over. "A lot of people in the Indian community worry that this is going to be a five-minute shot in the arm for Indian problems and everybody is going to forget it after 1992," Campbell said. "Everybody will go back to business as usual, and the Indian people will still be suffering the way they did before."

POLITICAL AGENDAS

However the 1992 events turn out, Indians, Hispanics and other groups have already assured that the quincentenary will differ greatly from what Congress had in mind when it created the Columbus jubilee commission eight years ago.

Like the annual Columbus Day parades in big cities such as Boston, Chicago and New York, the quincentenary jubilee was initially envisioned by many as an excuse for a year-long celebration of Italian heritage. Nearly half of the public members named to the 30-member federal commission were prominent Italian-Americans.

"I don't think anybody viewed this as anything more than another significant chronological anniversary to 'do' in the same way all the other commemoratives had been done," said Robert B. Blancato, now the director of institute and public policy for the National Italian-American Foundation in Washington, who at the time worked for then-Rep. Mario Biaggi, D-N.Y., one of the act's sponsors.

"As far as an Indian person being a full member of the [national quincentenary] commission, I don't think that occurred to them collectively at the very beginning," said Bill Ray, a Klamath Indian who is a member of the Oregon Commission on Indian Services. Thanks to pressure from Native American, Hispanic and church groups, Ray was named to the commission last month. He had served as an honorary member and chairman of its Native American Advisory Committee since 1989.

The political turn of events has even surprised the academic world, where vociferous argument has been going on for decades, if not centuries, about what kind of a person Columbus was, where his ship actually made landfall, the exchange of foods and diseases that resulted from the encounter, the full extent of the indigenous civilizations and the reasons for their demise.

We thought there would be much more [in the way of] vigorous intellectual debates [as 1992 approached]. Those haven't taken place," said Franklin W. Knight, a professor of Latin American and Caribbean history at the Johns Hopkins University in Baltimore and an adviser to various projects to observe the quincentenary. "What we have are a lot of polemical debates."

A hard core of Italian-Americans is determined to proceed along traditional lines. Columbus: Countdown 1992, a private, nonprofit organization based in New York City, for example, has commissioned portraits of 15th century navigators, published books about Columbus and the Italian Renaissance and produced a video of a puppet play about Columbus.

"I say it's the discovery of America by the Europeans, and it's the logical extension of the Renaissance," said Anne Paolucci, an English professor at St. John's University in New York City and founder of the Countdown organization. "The native populations, when they get on their soap opera boxes and start spouting off these days, they're saying what amounts to 'When did you stop beating your wife?' To accuse Columbus and the people who came with him of all these things [slavery, genocide, etc.] is really a sin."

But some larger Italian-American organizations have changed their tune. Though Blancato of the National Italian-American Foundation complained that the "media has given [the quincentennial critics], in our assessment, an undue amount of attention," he said the foundation has made overtures to Native American and Hispanic critics to work together on projects of mutual interest, such as health care and education. "We're looking for avenues for dialogue for the future," he said.

Organized Hispanics got an early appreciation of the public relations opportunities presented by the quincentenary. Both as immigrants and as descendants of indigenous populations taught the language of Spanish conquerors, most Hispanics in this country have long been treated as second-class citizens. Now, they'd like to use the quincentenary to showcase their history and the contributions of the ancestors.

"We saw 1992 as an opportunity to tell the rest of the world and the American people about how American we were, how integral we were to the development of this nation and how important we continue to be," said Raul Yzaguirre, president of the Washington-based National Council of La Raza, one of the largest Hispanic advocacy organizations. "Lewis and Clark [in 1804–06] found American Indians speaking Spanish and with Spanish artifacts," he noted.

But in 1985, it looked as if the Hispanics would be left out of the quincentenary just as they say they were ignored in the American bicentennial blowout in 1976. "All of a sudden, instead of the focus being on the opening of a new world by a Spanish civilization, it was the discovery of America by one individual," Yzaguirre said. "It was an Italian event." So the Hispanics organized their own National Hispanic Quincentennial Commission, with Yzaguirre at its helm.

Because so many Hispanics have Indian ancestry, Yzaguirre said his organization developed close working ties with Native American groups. But some Hispanic advocates are suspicious of the receptivity that has been given to the Indians' demands for recognition.

"There are people who realize that Hispanics are going to be very powerful very soon—the largest minority group within the next 20 years—and so what they are doing is a very sophisticated version of Hispanic bashing," said Barbara A. Tenenbaum, editor in chief of the *Encyclopedia of Latin American History* and vice president of the Hispanic quincentennial commission. "Native Americans are not going to be a power in this country ever, so it's safe to advocate their cause. It's not as though the quincentenary is being used to say all Europeans were disgusting, only that the Spanish were rotten."

Native Americans insist they don't want to be played off against the Hispanics; they simply want their rights as citizens and the dignity of human beings, which begins with the accurate recounting of history. To the Indians, therefore, the quincentenary presented the biggest challenge, but ultimately the biggest prize.

Some observers interpret the change in Native American lobbying tactics on the quincentenary as part of their coming of age in American society.

"It is a reflection very largely of the greater organization and consciousness and capacity to move in American society of spokesmen for the American Indians," said William H. McNeill, University of Chicago historian and a vice chairman of the national quincentennial commission. "There are now enough educated persons who have no handicap in discoursing in English and explaining their dissatisfaction with the traditional image."

Harjo and other Indian leaders describe an evolution from the frustration-provoked violence of American Indian Movement activists in the 1970s to a more calculated effort to work through mainstream institutions such as the schools, the news media, the museums and the sports world. "There are fewer than two million Indians in this country, and we can't tell our story to everyone one by one," Harjo said. Every summer, Harjo urges high school principals at an institute held at Harvard University to change history curriculums. She also solicits support at sportswriters' meetings for ending the use of Indian names for athletic teams.

A segment of the Indian community still believes violence, or at least disruption of quincentennial activities, is the only way to capture public attention. But the mainstream participants disavow that course as counterproductive. "Whatever the results, they would be short-lived," Ray said. "We're looking for more longterm awareness."

Over the long term, he said, the tribes want to build a constituency for such Native American priorities as Indian land claims, freedom of religious practices legislation and the return of bones and religious objects by museums, as well as social programs to improve Indian education and combat alcoholism and high suicide rates.

The Indians had an early and powerful ally in the National Council of Churches, which adopted a strong resolution in May 1990 denouncing church participation or acquiescence in observations honoring what it described as genocide against indigenous people and the institution of slavery. The resolution called on its 32 member denominations to refrain from celebrating the quincententary and instead to engage in activities of reflection and repentance.

"It was a highly controversial resolution at the beginning, but they hung in with it and took the punches with it," said Council of Churches' consultant Toineeta. "And now many of the denominations have adopted resolutions with similar flavor."

The council's resolution lists African-Americans among the victims of the 1492 encounter but does not emphasize their plight. In fact, surprisingly little attention has been focused on the whole aspect of slavery. A probable reason is the absence of black voices in the general clamor over the quincentenary.

In 1984 and 1985, black organizations reacted to the initial quincentennial plans in a manner similar to that of Native Americans,

John Herbert, the Library of Congress's quincentenary coordinator, recalled. "They asked, 'Why should we celebrate?" Hebert said. Unlike the Indians, however, who have taken a "very forceful and vocal and demonstrative position, I have not seen a similar sharpening of focus from African-American society," he said. "There hasn't been the same follow-up that says 'What we will do instead is this.'"

SHAPING THE STORY

Although Native American activists say that the film documentaries and museum exhibits developed for the quincentennial are not sufficiently pro-Indian, most such efforts have taken pains to acknowledge the cultures Columbus encountered in 1492. There have also been fewer re-creations of the event than many observers had expected.

"We thought we would be overwhelmed by movies and television programs about Columbus, and that certainly has not yet happened," Johns Hopkins's Knight said. "I heard talk about three movies, but I don't know of any of them in advanced production." The recession, the disarray of the quincentenary commission and fear of arousing controversy are generally given as reasons why such projects have had difficulty attracting financial support.

Knight was an adviser to the only television series that has aired so far, the seven-part *Columbus and the Age of Discovery*, produced by WGBH in Boston and shown on PBS last October. The documentary used the disputed word *discovery* "because this is what it was," Knight said. "Everybody discovered something about themselves, about others and about the wider world."

Some television critics complained that the series, which took pains to include European, Native American, African, Asian and Middle Eastern perspectives, was boring.

But advocates on all sides agreed it presented a balanced picture. During the course of filming from 1986–88, Knight said, Indians interviewed in several countries expressed increasing political interest in how the Columbus story was being presented. The National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH) contributed $650,000 toward the production's $6.5 million budget.

But the NEH rejected a request for financial aid by an independent filmmaker, Yanna Kroyt Brandt, for his proposed four-part series called *1492—A clash of Visions*. NEH deputy chairwoman Celeste Colgan said it was turned down because its script characterized the Aztecs as "very benign" in contrast with "the rapaciousness and greed of the Spanish conquistadors." She added that "the word genocide was applied to Columbus in a way that our national council members felt was really troubling."

Complaints about NEH financing decisions have also come from those who wish to honor Columbus's role in history. "It's so sad to see the energy expended on confrontation when here we are working on a shoestring," the pro-Italian Paolucci of St. Johns University said. "We have no grant money, no nothing. How we manage, I don't know."

Colgan said the NEH's goal in awarding grants was to avoid presentations that are "directed at persuading an audience to a particular political, philosophical, religious or ideological point of view or advocate a particular program of social action."

Two museum exhibitions mounted in Washington—the National Gallery of Art's recently completed *Circa 1492: Art in the Age of Exploration* and the Smithsonian's *Seeds of Change*—epitomize the emphasis on objectivity and balance (Harjo called them "safe and boring"). *Seeds of Change* is only one of more than 100 quincentenary events the Smithsonian plans, but it is the centerpiece of the institution's commemorative calendar.

"Very sensitive issues were being dealt with," the Smithsonian's Gonzalez acknowledged. "So [the institution] tried to discuss it in as objective a way as possible." One way that was done was by emphasizing disease as a major killer of the indigenous population rather than violent acts by European discoverers and colonizers. "If you want to get away from genocide, it's easier to talk about disease," said James Axtell, a humanities professor at the College of William and Mary in Williamsburg, Va., and chairman of the American Historical Association's Columbus Quincentenary Committee.

But Gonzalez doesn't interpret the encounter or the institution's depiction of it as totally neutral. "You can't deny that there was a deliberate intent [to destroy or at least weaken the native cultures]," she said. "Every group approached us," she said. "Many groups came ready to battle. In the end, we worked with many of them."

Hebert of the Library of Congress criticized the Smithsonian show for not hitting hard enough at the problem of slavery in a segment that focused on the development of the sugar trade. "That was hardly really a response, to damn one product rather than the process" he said. Hebert said the library is planning an exhibit, *1492, An Ongoing Voyage*, that will present manuscripts and other archival items in which slavery will be given greater stress.

Some scholars, such as Axtell, worry that the politics of the quincentenary could prove counterproductive to the aims of the Indians and others. "I see dangers in the abrupt kind of moralizing that's going on, using little pieces of information from the past for political or moral purposes" he said. "It treats the Indians like nothing but victims, passive helpless victims who just got run roughshod over. And they weren't that; they were much stronger."

To many Native Americans, the real reason for dwelling on this issue is not the past but the future. "there's certainly the historical perspective," Ray said. "but the real important thing for tribes today is what do we do now. We have crucial issues that the tribes have to face. What can be done to help them solve those problems?"

TRIBUTE TO DR. JOHN H. GIBBONS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Technology Assessment Board, I am pleased to call to your attention the singular honor recently received by Dr. John H. Gibbons, Director of the Office of Technology Assessment. On behalf of the OTA, Dr. Gibbons accepted the Officer's Cross of the Order of Merit from the Federal Republic of Germany. The medal, issued only by the President of the Federal Republic, honors those whose work has contributed significantly to Germany. It is only rarely awarded to non-Germans.

The German Bundestag recently established an office modeled after OTA. The special scientific unit performs assessments, monitors scientific and technological developments, and integrates its work into the parliamentary process. OTA has also assisted efforts to establish similar agencies in Western Europe and Asia.

In accepting the award, Dr. Gibbons said, "we all appreciate the profound influence that science and technology are having on the course of history. There is a new sense of global community, not only among scientists, but also among policymakers and others. A key issue is how our leaders can make wise decisions in an age increasingly driven by technological change."

As the complex technological issues Congress brings to OTA for analysis become increasingly international in nature, from telecommunications and space exploration to adequate energy supply and nuclear waste disposal, the establishment of close contacts with other nations can provide the agency with an invaluable network of information sources for crafting thoughtful and comprehensive public policy options. Congress can be extremely proud of Dr. Gibbons' leadership at the Office of Technology Assessment.

THE NEED FOR ANTISECRECY LEGISLATION IN FEDERAL COURTS

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, in 1984, a California jury ruled for a plaintiff who complained that the manufacturer of silicone breast implants failed to warn of the potential for severe side effects. Why have so few people heard about what today is a major health concern for thousands of women?

Because the court issued an order that prohibited the plaintiff from telling anybody—even the Food and Drug Administration—what she learned.

Today, courts can still prohibit the disclosure of certain information, and they may approve secrecy agreements that seal a case's files after settlement—even if that information could save another person's life.

While these orders settle a dispute between the two parties, they also prevent anybody else from seeing information on defective products that may be injuring people every day. The present system, in essence, condones the withholding of lifesaving information from average citizens.

We must correct this imbalance in our judicial system. In April 1991, I introduced H.R. 2017, the Federal Litigation in the Sunshine Act. This bill would make it difficult for courts to conceal information on a public hazard.

The December 1991 issue of a ABA Journal contains an interesting article that reinforces my argument for disclosure legislation. It is entitled "Secrecy Versus Safety—Restoring the Balance."

I urge my colleagues to read the article, which follows my comments. If they agree that at times the safety of society overrides the need for secrecy, then I hope that they will cosponsor H.R. 2017.

If we do not change the present situation, then who knows what health problem, known

to a few today, will become a serious problem in 10 years.

SECRECY VERSUS SAFETY—RESTORING THE BALANCE

(By Bob Gibbins)

In 1984, a San Francisco federal court case set the stage for a display of the potential of protective orders to delay government regulation and conceal threats to public health. It provides a potent look at the workings of secrecy in litigation—and clearly reflects why determined action is essential to restore balance to America's justice system. (For another view, see Arthur Miller's "Private Lives or Public Access," August 1991 *ABA Journal*, page 64.)

That case, *Stern v. Dow Corning Corp.* (U.S. Dist. Ct., N.D. Cal., No. C83-2348), involved silicone breast implants used in reconstructive surgery. The jury rendered a verdict for the plaintiff on her complaint that the manufacturer committed fraud and failed to warn of the potential for severe side effects. The case was settled while on appeal.

After *Stern* was concluded, a protective order demanded by the implant manufacturer remained in force. It prohibited the plaintiff's attorneys and expert witnesses from telling government regulators or anyone else what the discovery documents showed about safety tests of the product.

Even at a 1988 U.S. Food and Drug Administration hearing held to consider requiring implant manufacturers to demonstrate safety, a *Stern* attorney subject to that protective order was unable to disclose information about clinical or animal tests.

A medical school professor who examined more than a dozen breast implant litigation files has been similarly prohibited, by protective orders in every case, from sharing his knowledge of tests with FDA or congressional investigators. Here is an example of a publicly funded inquiry of a possibly dangerous product; yet a medical school professor is legally gagged through a process funded by taxpayers.

The protective-order strategy was used by several manufacturers, and it bought them time. Manufacturers produced and sold implants for at least six years after the *Stern* verdict, until the FDA took its first look at the companies' clinical data in 1991.

The agency concluded that no test results submitted by any manufacturer demonstrated the safety of implants, and one manufacturer has since recalled its entire line and announced its withdrawal from the breast implant market. But while the FDA vacillated and numerous product liability cases were settled with confidentiality "agreements" and protective orders, 150,000 new patients received implants each year.

Secrecy devices have been used increasingly in litigation during the past decade. A comprehensive new study of products liability litigation involving punitive damages awards revealed a marked increase in the use of confidential settlements after 1986. Conducted by professors Michael Rustad of Suffolk University Law School and Thomas Koenig of Northeastern University, the study examined a quarter-century of data.

Recent litigation involving the prescription sleeping medication Halcion further shows how secrecy, along with lax pharmaceutical regulation, multiplies consumer risks. In 1989 a blanket protective order was entered in *Grundberg v. The Upjohn Co.* (U.S. Dist. Ct., D. Utah, No. C89-274), a case that alleged severe, unpredictable mood changes caused by this drug now used by several million Americans. The *Grundberg* protective order effectively made all documents produced by the defendant confidential and required their return or destruction following the conclusion of the lawsuit. But shortly after *Grundberg* was settled, Halcion's manufacturer acknowledged that clinical data submitted to the FDA during the drug approval process were incomplete.

As it stands, the *Grundberg* protective order leaves an unknown number of patients and doctors wondering what caused side effects. Considering that the plaintiff in *Grundberg* had killed her own mother (although charges against her were dismissed because of involuntary intoxication with Halcion), access to complete information is crucial. A consumer organization is now asking the court to modify the protective order.

Other examples of the threat posed by secrecy are, unfortunately, not hard to come by:

A patient with a Shiley artificial heart valve is unable to learn of the danger that the device's mechanism may fracture. She dies when the valve fails, and her husband later learns that the manufacturer secretly settled litigation brought by other victims years before.

In part through that practice, the company avoids the notoriety that could have led to earlier warning of patients and/or withdrawal of the valves from the market.

A congressional investigative report ("The Bjork-Shiley Heart Valve: Earn as You Learn." House Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, Committee on Energy and Commerce, 2/90) cites "numerous instances" of deaths that might have been avoided had patients and doctors been aware of the danger earlier. *Barbee v. Shiley, Inc.* (claim was settled in 1989 without filing complaint).

The widow of a police officer killed in the crash of a traffic-control plane is denied discovery of evidence of the airplane's design defect because of a confidential settlement "agreement" in another case. The aircraft type is still in use. *Turnberger v. Cessna Aircraft Co.*, Broward City., Fla., 17th Jud. Cir. Ct., No. 83-12392.

A scientist who herself suffered a potentially fatal allergic reaction to a painkiller—later withdrawn from the market—discovers that other victims were similarly affected several years earlier but were sworn to secrecy. She also discovers that some confidential settlement "agreements" even prohibited discussion of adverse reactions in scientific journals. *Davis v. McNeilab, Inc.*, U.S. Dist., Ct., D.C., No. 85-CV-3972 (case settled in 1986).

While private matters having no public impact and true trade secrets justify confidentiality, it is inconsistent with the impartial administration of justice for a publicly created and maintained legal system to help hide responsibility for misconduct.

Events that lead to litigation often have an impact well beyond the immediate parties, and that impact can be deadly. In today's age of mass manufacturing and distribution, a dispute brought before a court can involve a potentially life-threatening hazard that already may have affected thousands of citizens, and may affect even more in the future.

Confidentiality "agreements" in products liability cases can keep information about the dangers of defective products from coming to the attention of government regulators, the news media and others who could alert the public.

And in medical negligence cases, the doctors alleged to have caused an injury may well have other patients undergoing the same procedures. Secret settlements and sealed files can enable physicians to keep practicing without having to account for substandard care. The same concerns apply to injurious behavior in other professions.

In fact, in all types of tort litigation, both the deterrent and compensation functions of the civil justice system can be stifled by secrecy. Beyond leaving past victims ignorant of the cause of their injuries and future victims vulnerable, secrecy also can make it more difficult for victims to prepare and prove their cases.

Secrecy can make it more likely that critical evidence will be concealed or destroyed without ever being discovered.

A legal system that functions in this way is out of balance, which is why there is growing support for changes in court rules and procedures to eliminate unwarranted secrecy. Those who advocate such change seek a fairer balance between privacy and property rights on one side, and public health and safety on the other. Restoring lost balance also could help to reduce injuries and resulting litigation.

The imbalance in the tort litigation system is rooted in abuses of otherwise legitimate rights. The litigation playing field was level when the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and other similar reforms of litigation practice were inaugurated in the 1930s. The system at that time provided protection for truly personal information (the reasons why a divorce was sought, or why child custody was refused) and true trade secrets (chemical formulae, manufacturing methods, details of distribution networks).

Some segments of the legal community now attempt to protect classes of information that go well beyond the original plan. They are advised to misuse the "trade secret" and "privacy" labels, claiming special protection for information never intended to have confidential status under the rules of civil procedure, and claiming corporate privacy rights never recognized by American law.

From this attempt to expand the idea of protected information into new areas, there has developed a well-known arsenal of devices intended to protect wrongdoers:

"Agreements" that prohibit disclosure of the compensation paid in a settlement, the names of the parties, and sometimes even the fact that litigation occurred;

Sealed court files that can conceal the very existence of the lawsuit;

Protective orders that require the return or destruction of discovery information after the termination of the litigation, and prohibit sharing discovery material with other attorneys handling similar cases or with government agencies; and

Prohibitions against attorneys handling similar cases in the future.

New secrecy strategies are still emerging. In medical malpractice cases, for instance, negotiated dismissals of individual physicians have been used to keep the doctors' names out of the federal government's data bank of malpractice verdicts and settlements, thus thwarting an important public policy.

Secrecy proponents argue that confidentiality makes litigation go more smoothly and promotes early settlement, and indeed it may—when the advocates of secrecy get their way.

But secrecy also can delay the resolution of litigation, consume large amounts of lawyers' time, and strain the courts' capacity to move cases toward a conclusion—as shown

by a recent federal court opinion in *Wauchop* v. *Domino's Pizza, Inc.* (U.S. Dist. Ct., S.D. Ind., No. S90-496). The plaintiffs in *Wauchop* sought information on the corporation's promise to deliver food by car in 30 minutes or less, arguing that the policy may have led to an auto collision.

The defendants demanded that much of the discovery material requested by the plaintiffs be protected against further disclosure. The court concluded that secrecy was not justified for most categories of the material, but the defendants' demand for a protective order forced the court to read motions, review and analyze numerous discovery requests, and render its conclusions in an opinion and order more than 30 pages long. The judge properly lamented that the federal rules on discovery "should be self-executing through the cooperation of counsel."

To stabilize this out-of-balance system and counteract the harm secrecy can cause, this country needs a strong presumption of openness for court proceedings and records.

We need adequate procedures to ensure that the trial judge will consider the public's interest in information that would be concealed under a proposed protective order. Advocates of secrecy argue that existing procedures already allow courts to consider the public interest as part of the exercise of judicial discretion, but widespread approval of protective orders and confidentiality "agreements" suggests that the public interest has not been made a routine part of the courts' calculus.

The Association of Trial Lawyers of America acted in 1989 to focus attention on the multiple problems caused by secrecy. ATLA's Board of Governors passed a resolution encouraging:

Courts to scrutinize requests for secrecy and grant them only when information sought to be protected is a true trade secret or can qualify for some other privilege;

Courts to allow sharing of discovery material with attorneys handling similar cases, regulatory agencies and professional boards;

Courts to liberally grant relief from preexisting orders and "agreements" that unfairly impose secrecy; and

Attorneys to resist secrecy demands that preclude sharing information with regulatory agencies and other lawyers, and discouraging them from agreeing to proposed secrecy orders.

By now eight states have joined the movement away from secrecy. Some of this initiative has come from judges themselves. In 1990, the Texas Supreme Court was the first court to amend its rules to recognize a presumption of openness for all court proceedings, and to establish procedures to be followed for any request to seal court files.

Court rules with a similar focus on openness have been adopted by the New York State Administrative Board of the Courts, the San Diego County Superior Court, and the Delaware Supreme Court and Chancery Court.

In 1990, a different approach was taken by Florida, which passed legislation that identified a class of dangers as "public hazard," and prohibited concealment of such hazards through judicial processes.

Narrower mechanisms have been adopted in several other states. These include specific procedures to be followed in disclosing discovery materials to attorneys handling similar cases (adopted in Virginia in 1989), and standards for confidentiality regarding litigation by and against state government (adopted in North Carolina, Florida and Oregon).

Other bills and proposed court rules are under consideration in many states, most based on either the Texas or Florida models, and usually with the support of consumer, labor, environmental, senior citizen or media organizations.

The mechanics of the new measures aside, an obvious question is what the new rules and procedures change, and what they leave underchanged.

The new mechanisms give no one any new substantive rights of action. They cannot engender new cases. Nor, in any known case, do they expose strictly personal information or reveal genuine trade secrets to the public.

The changes do, obviously, give judges new duties of review in a number of situations. But once it becomes clear that requests for secrecy will be measured against the public interest, the number of secrecy demands should decrease, so that the net result is the same or better than what has been observed in the past.

The same effect should be noticeable in terms of the cost of litigation. Market forces can be expected to work against satellite litigation when clients realize that demands for unjustified secrecy will not succeed, and that they may be penalized.

Perhaps most importantly, the new measures do not infringe on judicial discretion. Indeed, they depend on judges to exercise discretion as much as the former rules ever did. They provide standards to be met by litigants, like many other written standards of proof, and prescribe what the results will be if the judge determines that the standards have not been met.

There is at least some evidence of improvement already. An ATLA member who practices in Minnesota, where no legislation has yet been passed on secrecy, recently observed a dramatic reversal of the Shiley heart valve manufacturer's previous use of secrecy demands, as well as judges' awareness of the issue of secrecy and the potential it has for harm.

These developments suggest that secrecy advocates' dire warnings about increased satellite litigation and diminished access to information are exaggerated. Their predictions imply that America's judges would allow the courts to slow to a crawl, and that members of the bar and the public would accept dramatic increases in litigation costs. Experienced judges and trial lawyers, however, will not tolerate such a result.

The goal here is to have a safer society. One way to attain that goal is to create mechanisms designed to help protect us all.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE MASSACRE OF LITHUANIAN NATIONALISTS IN VILNIUS

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commemorate the first anniversary of the Soviet crackdown in Lithuania. On January 13, 1991, 14 Lithuanian nationalists were killed in Vilnius by Soviet troops. The Lithuanians died resisting the Soviet attempt to seize the Lithuanian radio and TV center and the Vilnius TV tower.

One year later, thousands of Lithuanians gathered in a vastly different country to pay tribute to their 14 compatriots. Tears mixed with pride as President Landsbergis, now head of the independent nation of Lithuania, addressed the crowd in the early morning hours.

The crackdown in the streets of Vilnius was truly the beginning of the end for the Soviet Union. The killings in Vilnius caused a shower of criticism to rain down on former Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev, which lead to the resurgence of the hard-line element, setting the stage for the unsuccessful August coup. The coup, in turn, lead to the ultimate downfall of the Soviet system. As President Landsbergis said in a special address to the Lithuanian parliament, "The Soviet world was defeated here."

Mr. Speaker, the Lithuanian people who fought the giant Soviet military machine in the streets of Vilnius deserve a large share of the credit for bringing an end to the Soviet Union. This small nation stood up to the Soviet violence. Lithuania's bravery was ultimately rewarded in September, when Lithuania and the other Baltic States received international and Soviet diplomatic recognition.

Today, Lithuania faces many challenges. Soviet troops remain on Baltic soil. Those responsible for the massacre have not yet been brought to justice. Lithuanians and their friends still feel the loss of the 14 who gave their lives so courageously. We are proud, Mr. Speaker, of their struggle and of the hard-won freedom Lithuania and the other formerly Soviet-dominated States enjoy today.

VA HOSPITALS DELIVER OUTSTANDING HEALTH CARE

HON. G.V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, it's time the American public was given the true picture of the state of veterans' health care in this country. So-called studies and media investigative reports of VA medicine in the recent past have stimulated a tremendous amount of negative publicity and, in the process, have done a tragic disservice to a fine health care system and to the constituency it serves.

No one is in a better position to gauge the quality of care delivered by VA than its health care personnel and patients, and the Veterans' Affairs Committee hears from them daily. I'd like to share with my colleagues the words of a recent patient of our fine veterans' hospital here in Washington—Walt Kennedy, minority Sergeant at Arms for the House—regarding the wonderful care he received.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, December 10, 1991.

Hon. G.V. MONTGOMERY,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SONNY: First off I want to express my deep appreciation for your kind wishes during my recent hospitalization and convalescence. In times such as I recently experienced it is a friendship such as yours that means so much.

I mentioned to you my high regards for the treatment accorded me at the VA Medical Center in Washington. I did so because I am

upset at the trashing from numerous areas that hit at these hospitals. I thought you might be interested in letters I have written to Secretary Derwinski and the Director of the hospital. These units deserve better than is usually given them.

With best wishes for a most happy Christmas Season and New Year, I am

Respectfully,

WALTER P. KENNEDY,
Minority Sergeant at Arms.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 18, 1991.

Hon. EDWARD DERWINSKI,
Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, Washington, DC.

DEAR ED: Within these past few weeks it has been necessary for me to be hospitalized. During a recent angiogram two blockages in a heart artery were diagnosed and inasmuch as I had by-pass five years ago angioplasty was recommended. With the choice of any hospital in this area available to me I chose the VA Medical Center primarily because I know of the outstanding physicians in cardiac care who are practicing at the hospital. I refer to Doctors Fletcher, Singh and Papademetriou.

I had the angioplasty performed and initially it was successful. However, about 14 hours later during the early morning hours one of the blockages seemed to explode and while every effort was made to reopen the artery I suffered a heart attack. For the next ten days or so I was carefully shepherded back to good health and herein is the purpose of this letter.

As you know I can look with critical eye on all aspects of the hospital operation but Ed, I can not help but express my amazement at the professionalism I witnessed in every area. The cooperation between all in the medical backup, nurses, aides, interns, etc., was superb. The attitudes of all were cheery and helpful and this atmosphere certainly helped in my speedy convalescence. But not only was the attitude in my case alone, I noted it among each and every patient and these patients remarked to me in conversation how friendly and warm all of the personnel were as they performed their duties.

In addition, the hospital itself had a cheery look, clean and organized and I must say no small commendation must go to the Director, Mr. Williams.

Your VA hospitals do not have the public relation people selling it to the public and to the legislative branch but I for one can personally attest to all I have stated and more with regard to your flagship hospital in Washington. I would be ever so grateful if you would, in my behalf, extend to all in the hospital who were so professional and kind to me my personal gratitude and appreciation.

Also Ed, because I feel so strong in this regard I am taking the opportunity of forwarding a copy of this letter to Chairman Montgomery of the House Committee on Veterans Affairs.

With all best personal wishes, I am

Sincerely,

WALTER P. KENNEDY,
Minority Sergeant at Arms.

Mr. Speaker, I'm sure many of my colleagues have seen news reports and articles which have maligned the VA health care system and, in my opinion, have unduly alarmed its current and potential patient population. It concerns me greatly that such reports will be accepted at face value and will be the sole basis upon which many veterans, and Americans in general, will form their opinions of our veterans' medical facilities and the dedicated people who staff them.

The most recent study to have criticized VA medicine—instigated by a congressional subcommittee—was shown by two prestigious schools of public health to have used a seriously flawed methodology in reaching its conclusions. As a result, 30 VA hospitals were unfairly and inaccurately labeled as substandard and are fighting to regain their prestige.

This is not to say that our veterans' hospital system doesn't have problems. No health care system as massive as the VA is going to be perfect. But veterans and their families should rest assured that the health care they receive from the thousands of diligent VA professionals across the country is at least on a par with, if not better than, that offered by the private sector.

The VA, which operates the Nation's largest health care delivery system, treats 1.1 million patients a year in its 172 hospitals and records more than 20 million outpatient visits annually at its 356 clinics.

VA is affiliated with 104 medical schools and 59 dental schools. More than half of all practicing physicians—both in the Government and private sectors—have received at least part of their professional education in the VA health care system. Each year, approximately 100,000 health professionals receive training in VA medical centers. VA physicians are recognized as some of the best; they have to be, otherwise, these affiliations would not be maintained. The medical schools simply would not tolerate any type of substandard training environment. Furthermore, every VA facility has met the strict accreditation criteria of the Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations.

While VA has consistently worked to maintain the quality of its care, it had not done as good a job of monitoring that quality, but the Congress has corrected that. In addition, we have strengthened the role of the medical inspector and expanded the responsibilities of the inspector general.

Mr. Speaker, the truth is that the VA health care system is sound and provides exceptionally good care. The following letters from Mrs. Creed McClure of Tullahoma, TN, further illustrate this point.

JANUARY 16, 1992.

Hon. GILLESPIE V. MONTGOMERY,
Chairman, Committee on Veterans' Affairs, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MONTGOMERY: On October 31, 1991, my husband, Creed McClure, passed away at the Alvin C. York Medical Center, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.

I mentioned to our mutual friend, Nat I. Washburn, that I wanted to express my sincere appreciation to you, since you give so much of your time and concern to the Veterans' programs.

Words are inadequate to express my gratitude to the Administration, staff, doctors, nurses and aides for the wonderful professional care he received. Since his illness necessitated long-term treatment, I felt most fortunate to have had him in the Veterans' hospital in Murfreesboro.

Creed was a patient in the 5A-North Building. The staff, doctors, nurses and aides were so very caring and concerned. Particularly was I impressed by the professionalism of Ms. Elizabeth Barnes and Mrs. Violet Jennings, although the entire group was wonderful to both him and me.

As I have previously written you, I am most grateful for the time you contribute to veterans' affairs and that my husband and I have been among the fortunate recipients of your concern.

With my best wishes for your continued success in all you do, I am

Very respectfully yours,

Mrs. CREED D. MCCLURE.

JANUARY 16, 1992.

Mr. BRIAN HECKERT,
Director, Alvin C. York Medical Center, Murfreesboro, TN.

DEAR MR. HECKERT: On October 31, 1991, my husband, Creed McClure, passed away after having been a patient in your hospital for two and one-half years.

Words are inadequate to express my sincere appreciation to the administration, staff, doctors, nurses, aides and particularly, the people of 5A North for his professional care. Because his illness necessitated long-term treatment, I felt I was most fortunate to have had him in your hospital.

The people of 5A North were most caring and concerned! I was particularly impressed by the professionalism of Ms. Elizabeth Barnes and Mrs. Violet Jennings, although the entire group was wonderful to both him and me. I shall be eternally grateful to them.

You have a tremendous, never-ending task, and I wish you well in all your decisions and endeavors. The American people should be forever grateful to you and all the VA hospitals everywhere. I am one of those people!

Very respectfully yours,

Mrs. CREED D. MCCLURE.

Mr. Speaker, I am confident that, with improved funding levels, we will sustain the high caliber of VA direct medical care which Walt Kennedy, Mr. and Mrs. McClure, and hundreds of thousands of others have experienced, as well as the VA scientific research program, which benefits veterans and nonveterans alike.

WHEN PRESIDENT'S SPEECH IS OVER, LEGISLATING WILL BEGIN

HON. DEAN A. GALLO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. GALLO. Mr. Speaker, tonight the President will again discharge his constitutional duty of reporting to the Congress on the state of the Union and recommending to it such measures as he may consider important to the well-being of our Republic.

The American people look to the President to provide the leadership and vision necessary to define and meet the problems and the possibilities that confront our Nation. I have every confidence that President Bush will meet this challenge boldly and confidently.

But when the President's speech is over, the television lights have been dimmed, and the last instant analysis has been aired, the hard, gritty work of legislating will begin. This is the challenge to which we in this House will have to rise. The American people expect it; duty demands it.

Over the course of the last 2 months, as I have talked with people in every corner of my district, no message has been made more clear to me than this: Do something to get our country moving again. The people of my district are sick of the politicking, tired of the posturing, and weary of the finger-pointing that seems to be substituting for governing in Washington lately.

This House is composed of an impressive collection of talented, dedicated, thoughtful, and sincere men and women. But sometimes it seems that its total is less than the sum of its parts. If we can turn that equation around, we can meet the challenges that confront us and make the American people proud of their Government and confident of their future.

In the coming weeks we will be debating the merits of various specific proposals designed to put our country firmly on the path to economic growth and prosperity. I will not take the time here to discuss those proposals in great detail—there will be time for that soon. But one thing for which there is no more time is delay. We must begin our work, and we must begin it now.

But, in acting quickly, we must avoid the temptation for a quick-fix driven more by election timetables than by responsible policymaking. The message in our current economic difficulties is that we have some underlying fundamental problems that will not be solved with a Band-Aid.

Among the fundamental and long-term actions I believe we must take are these:

We have to change the Tax Code to encourage capital formation and investment by lowering the capital gains tax rate;

We must take action to stimulate savings by expanding IRA's and allowing savers to earn tax free interest;

We have to encourage research and development into the technologies that will enable us to compete in an increasingly competitive world by making the R&D tax credit and allocation rules permanent;

We must take action to stimulate the Nation's real estate sector, including enacting passive loss reform;

We have to reform our banking system so that it serves as an engine of growth, not a brake;

We should permanently authorize small-issue industrial development bonds, one of the most effective tools we have for encouraging industrial growth;

We must not raise taxes.

In sum, we must eliminate those policies that inhibit the creative energy of the American people and restrict their incentives to participate in daring growth. We must make sure that we are rewarding those who would stride confidently into the future, not those who would stand pat.

The world in which we live today is vastly different from the one in which we lived when the 102d Congress first convened. We now live in a world with just one military superpower but with many aspiring economic superpowers.

Unless we recognize that a changing world requires us to reinvigorate our own economic machine, we will find ourselves swept aside by the dynamic tides of change that are sweeping the globe. These tides are empowering people in every corner of the Earth to achieve for themselves what their flawed governments never had any hope of being able to achieve for them.

Mr. Speaker, let us begin our work. Time—and tides—wait for no one.

CONGRATULATIONS TO ALICE BENOIT, R.N.

HON. THOMAS J. DOWNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. Speaker. It is with mixed feelings that I announce the retirement of Alice M. Benoit, R.N., the energetic nurse who has become almost an institution within not only the Rayburn Building, but also all over the Capitol. Alice Benoit will be leaving us on January 31, and with her she takes memories of over 24 years of service to Congress and its employees. My feelings are mixed because we will miss Alice, but we know that she will be enjoying a much more relaxed and leisurely lifestyle from now on, which is something to which we all aspire.

During Alice's tenure as an employee of the attending physician's office, she has treated literally thousands of patients, including Members of Congress, staffers, interns, pages, and visitors to the Capitol. She has given medical advice and treatment, provided medical referrals, handled emergencies, given allergy shots, blood pressures, and temperature readings, and sometimes just provided a friendly and soothing word to people when they needed it. Alice's cheerful demeanor and ability to accept and often laugh at life's challenges will be long remembered and sorely missed.

Alice is originally from St. John's, NF, Canada, and served as a nurse with the U.S. Army Air Corps from 1945 to 1949. She became an American citizen in 1948 in Mobile, AL, and married an Air Force pilot, Gene Benoit. When Gene was transferred to Wheelus Air Base in Tripoli, Lybia, North Africa, Alice worked as a civilian occupational nurse in Tripoli. Upon returning to the States, she worked as a public health nurse at various facilities in and around the Nation's Capital. Alice and her family were also stationed in Mexico City where she served as the head nurse at the American Embassy, once having the honor of personally meeting President John F. Kennedy during an official visit to Mexico City. Finally, Alice found her way to us directly from Bethesda Naval Hospital, where she worked as an R.N. As you can see, Alice's career has been extremely busy, and far from boring.

There is no doubt that someone who has been here on Capitol Hill for nearly a quarter of a century has many vivid memories and stories to tell. When Alice began working on the Hill, Lyndon Johnson was in the White House, miniskirts, go-go boots and bell bottoms were in style, and many Members of Congress here today were still in college or high school.

However, Alice has been blessed with the ability to grow with the times, and she has met many wonderful people who have helped her—and vice versa—along the way. She has always been professional and courteous, but most of all, she has been a friend to so many of us.

I know that it will be difficult for many of us to walk by her office in Rayburn and not hear her lighthearted humming.

She has provided a bright and optimistic attitude in a place where life is often taken too seriously, and has kept so many of us and our staffs healthy during stressful times.

I personally am envious of Alice now that she will have time to take it easy for a change. I wish her all the best and hope that she will not be a stranger to these hallowed halls for long.

I know that my colleauges join me in bidding her an affectionate and fond farewell, and congratulating Alice on this remarkable achievement. I join her family—her husband Gene, her daughter Moya and son-in-law Steve, and her son, Mark and daughter-in-law Toi in wishing her good health and happiness for many, many years to come.

TRIBUTE TO THE GUIDE DOGS FOR THE BLIND

HON. BARBARA BOXER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Guide Dogs for the Blind on the occasion of its golden anniversary.

Guide Dogs for the Blind is a remarkable organization in San Rafael, CA, that for 50 years has trained purebred dogs to be dog guides. It is one of the oldest programs of its type in the Nation. Located 20 miles north of the Golden Gate Bridge, its training campus includes a kennel complex, a spacious student dormitory, veterinary clinic, and administration building.

Guide dog training was quickly increased to serve qualified blind civilians after it began as a program to help World War II blind veterans. Since 1942, more than 6,000 men and women have received guide dogs and training free of charge.

Today, over 300 dogs-in-training begin their careers in guide dog kennels. Guide dogs entrusts the training of its puppies to 4–H Club members in the Western United States.

Guide Dogs for the Blind maintains its own breeding stock and uses only three breeds for guide dog work—German Shepherds, Golden Retrievers, and Labrador Retrievers. These breeds were selected for their medium size, even temperament, and short to medium-length coats. Every guide dog is a purebred, registered with the American Kennel Club.

Guide Dogs for the Blind now have graduates leading active and productive lives all over the United States and Canada. They're working in teaching, counseling, computers, media, and music, among many others. Guide Dogs for the Blind should rightfully be proud that their graduates enjoy the benefit of increased mobility through the use of these special dogs.

Mr. Speaker, I feel privileged to represent Guide Dogs for the Blind in California's Sixth

Congressional District, and I know my colleagues will want to join in congratulating the Guide Dogs for the Blind on the occasion of its 50th anniversary, and to express our hearty appreciation for its extraordinary record of service to the disabled community.

HOOVER POWER PLANT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1992

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce along with Representative DEFAZIO, the Hoover Power Plant Act amendments of 1992. This legislation updates and strengthens the energy conservation provisions included in the Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984. The bill will encourage the efficient use of federally subsidized power provided to customers of the Federal Western Area Power Administration [WAPA]. The wise use of this valuable resource will both reduce energy costs and protect the environment.

Under the bill, all WAPA firm power customers are required to conduct a balanced electric power planning process which considers both demand and supply side options for increasing power supplies. This type of planning is commonly referred to as "integrated resource planning" or "least-cost planning."

The experience of the past decade has revealed that a balanced planning process which gives full consideration to both demand and supply side power options is the key to achieving improvements in the efficiency of electricity use. This is the case because careful analysis of both supply and demand power alternatives often demonstrates that efficiency improvements are both the least expensive and most environmentally benign power supply available to an individual utility.

This legislation is needed because WAPA and many of its customers have lagged far behind their utility colleagues in other parts of the Nation in the area of integrated resource planning and efficiency improvements. Some of the more ambitious energy efficiency efforts have been undertaken over the past decade by California utilities and by WAPA's counterpart in the Northwest, the Bonnevile Power Administration [BPA].

For example, between 1981 and 1990, BPA's efficiency programs have added about 300 megawatts of direct energy savings to BPA's energy supply at the cost of approximately 2 cents per kilowatt-hour. Over the past 8 years, Southern California Edison and Pacific Gas and Electric have achieved about 2,000 megawatts of savings through efficiency improvements.

All of the above mentioned savings were achieved largely because of requirements that were imposed on investor-owned utilities by State regulators and on BPA through the Northwest Power Act. Unfortunately, WAPA has failed to provide this type of leadership.

Despite the fact that WAPA's Energy Conservation Program has been in existence for over 10 years and has cost $21 million, Western is unable to provide any verifiable estimate of the amount of energy saved due to its program. WAPA customers are able to comply with its current requirements by conducting token 1970's era energy efficiency measures such as putting flyers in utility bills and conducting a limited number of residential energy audits.

It must be noted that a number of Western customers have embarked upon ambitious integrated resource planning and efficiency programs. For example, the Sacramento Municipal Utility District [SMUD] plans to achieve up to 600 megawatts of energy savings over the next 10 years. However, the efficiency activities of SMUD and others have resulted more from leadership demonstrated at the utility level rather than from Western's extremely limited efforts.

WAPA is presently considering a revision of its Energy Conservation Program. Unfortunately, the proposal it has issued is a continuation of its rather feeble effort in this area. For example, WAPA would not require its customers to actually comply with their integrated resource plans. This could result in the planning process becoming a meaningless bureaucratic exercise.

In addition, Western has also failed to propose a requirement that its customers accurately compare the costs of various energy options. If these plans do not accurately compare costs, they will have little value and could be used to justify the acquisition of expensive power options when lower cost options are available.

The receipt of low-cost federally subsidized power is a privilege. WAPA and its customers have an obligation to the Nation to use increasingly scarce Federal hydropower resources in the most efficient manner possible. The Hoover Power Plant Act amendments of 1992 establish a framework for the most efficient use possible of this valuable resource.

I insert a copy of the attached section-by-section analysis of the bill at this point in the RECORD.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF HOOVER POWER PLANT ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1992

SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF HOOVER POWER PLANT ACT

Designation of Hoover Power Plant Act Amendments of 1992 as Title II of Hoover Power Plant Act of 1984.

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS

"Integrated resource planning" means a comparison of all practicable energy efficiency and energy supply options to identify the *least-cost option* for providing electric service.

"Least-cost-option" means an option for providing electric service which will minimize life-cycle system costs, and environmental costs, of providing such service.

SEC. 202. CONTRACTS TO REQUIRE INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANNING

Requires that Western Area Power Administration [WAPA] amend all firm power contracts to require purchasers to implement integrated resource planning within three years of enactment.

Requires that WAPA, within 180 days after enactment, prescribe a methodology to be used by WAPA customers for determining quantifiable environmental costs as part of their integrated resource plans.

SEC. 203. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

WAPA shall provide technical assistance to utilities to conduct integrated resource planning and comply with the requirements of this title.

SEC. 204. INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANS

(a) REVIEW BY WAPA.—Each purchaser shall submit an integrated resource plan to WAPA 12 months after their contract is amended. A revision of such plan shall be submitted every 3 years.

(b) CRITERIA FOR APPROVAL.—WAPA shall approve an integrated resource plan if it accurately compares life-cycle system costs and environmental costs for energy supply options; designates that the least-cost supply option is acquired; and, to the maximum extent practicable, minimizes adverse environmental effects of energy supply acquisitions.

(c) USE OF OTHER INTEGRATED RESOURCE PLANS.—Where a purchaser is implementing integrated resource planning under a program responding to Federal, State, or other initiatives, WAPA shall make due allowance for the incorporation of such elements within the least-cost plan required by this title.

(d) COMPLIANCE WITH LEAST-COST PLANS.—Each purchaser shall fully comply with its least-cost plan. WAPA shall review each purchaser's implementation of its least-cost plan at least once every 2 years to determine if the purchaser is in compliance with the plan. If WAPA finds the purchaser out-of-compliance, the Administrator shall impose either a surcharge on all power purchased from WAPA by the purchaser or a reduction in power allocation.

(e) ENFORCEMENT.—

(1) NO APPROVED PLAN.—If an integrated resource plan for any purchaser is disapproved by the Administrator and a revised plan not resubmitted within 9 months the Administrator shall impose a surcharge of 20 percent of the purchase price on all power obtained by that purchaser. The surcharge shall remain in effect until the plan is approved. If the plan is not approved for more than one year, the surcharge shall increase to 30 percent for the second year, and to 40 percent thereafter until the plan is approved.

(2) FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH APPROVED PLAN.—Identical surcharges shall be imposed whenever the Administrator determines that a purchasers activities are not consistent with its integrated resource plan.

(3) REDUCTION IN POWER ALLOCATION.—In lieu of imposing a surcharge under paragraphs (1) or (2) the Administrator may reduce a utility's power allocation. If the reduction is for the first year of a violation, the reduction shall be 10 percent of the power allocation otherwise available, for the second year the reduction shall be 20 percent and for each year thereafter the reduction shall be 30 percent.

(4) SUITS TO REQUIRE ENFORCEMENT.—Any person may bring an action against the Administrator in Federal District Court to require the Administrator to immediately approve or disapprove a plan; or impose a surcharge or power allocation whenever such surcharge is mandated in accordance with paragraphs (1), (2), and (3).

(5) APPEALS.—Any person subject to a surcharge or reduction in power allocation may appeal the imposition of such penalty within 30 days.

(f) LEAST-COST PLANNING COOPERATIVES.—With the approval of WAPA, purchasers may form least-cost planning cooperatives for the purposes of complying with this title.

SEC. 205. CONSERVATION PURCHASE

WAPA may purchase, at fair market value, firm energy savings directly produced from a

utility demand side management initiative carried out by a purchaser.

WAPA may only purchase energy savings if these savings are sold at fair market value or utilized to forego electric power generation in a manner which will reduce adverse environmental effects related to hydroelectric power operations.

SEC. 206. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT.

(b) PROHIBITION ON BLENDING OF POWER PRICES.

(c) REGULATIONS.

(d) ANNUAL REPORTS.

(e) FUNDING.—The Administrator shall adjust WAPA rates for the sale of electric energy to the extent necessary to cover all costs incurred under this title.

CHANNEL DEFENSE FUNDING INTO HEALTH CARE PROGRAMS

HON. LUCIEN E. BLACKWELL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. BLACKWELL. Mr. Speaker, as I read last Thursday's Washington Post on the train ride from Philadelphia, I was ecstatic to read that the President has announced steps to cut the Nation's entire force of nuclear-tipped MX intercontinental ballistic missiles. In addition, Mr. Bush has called for a scaling back of the B–2 Bomber Program. All in all, these much-needed cuts will save our country billions of dollars in defense spending.

No one can deny that the B–2's strategic nuclear objective has been diminished as the now-defunct Soviet Union no longer poses the overt threat that it once did. The President has obviously acknowledged this fact. As we stand at a major crossroads in our Nation's history, we now have an opportunity to channel the money saved from these defense cuts to fight the very real wars that exist right here on our own soil, in our own backyards. Indeed, the time has come for this administration to acknowledge another blatant and obvious fact.

Mr. Speaker, there are 37 million Americans without health insurance. I know that it has been echoed in the halls of this chamber in the past, but it must be repeated. Adequate health care should be a right, not a privilege. I will repeat the statistic that the lack of health insurance is not merely a problem for the poor, as 80 percent of those persons without medical insurance are members of working families. For me, my constituents, and many of my colleagues, this is simply unacceptable.

As the President addresses the Nation tonight, I urge him to consider the many encouraging steps we could take. Let's take these funds and gear them toward preventive health care. Long-term care. Healthy start to curb our Nations' atrocious rate of infant mortality. The list goes on and on Mr. Speaker.

Now that the iron curtain has been lifted, and the people of Eastern Europe are free from the shackles of oppression, it is time for us to free the citizens of our own country from the clenching fear of inadequate health care. The time to act is now.

HONORING MILDRED C. BIRD FOR 25 YEARS OF SERVICE TO BLOOMINGDALE, NJ

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, it is with distinct pleasure and great pride that I rise today to pay special tribute to Mildred C. Bird, who after 25 years of dedicated service to the borough of Bloomingdale, NJ, will retire. A career in public service can be a rewarding and satisfying experience. Certainly those who have worked along side and been assisted by this marvelous lady have experienced her commitment and professionalism. Millie will be honored at a special dinner on Sunday, February 1 at the lovely Wayne Manor, exactly 25 years to the day that she was appointed municipal clerk of the borough.

She was born in Mount Marion, NY, and after being voted "Most All-Around Senior" by her high school classmates, she went on to work in New York City for the next several years. After a move to Clifton, NJ, and the borough of Bloomingdale shortly thereafter, she assumed her role as municipal clerk and began her long and productive career. Millie has been extremely active in her profession holding the titles of registered municipal clerk in the State of New Jersey and certified municipal clerk in the International Institute of Municipal Clerks. She was named acting administrator of Bloomingdale in June 1987 and was named administrator in August 1989.

Locally, Millie served in every position upon the Passaic County Municipal Clerk's Association executive committee, including that of president and chairman of the groups 25th anniversary festivities. She also acted as an adviser from the county association to the State association before being elected to the State's executive committee, where she served in a variety of positions including president. Millie also participated in the first certified municipal clerks' course at Syracuse University, which is now taught at approximately 35 other universities and colleges, including Rutgers.

Always active in her community and willing to pledge her time and effort, Millie worked on both the borough's 50th Anniversary and National Bicentennial Committees. She has also served on the borough's Board of Health and was chairman of its United Way affiliate. In addition, she has been an active member of the United Methodist Church. Millie was also instrumental in the establishment, and was an auxiliary member, of the Bloomingdale VFW Memorial Post 9458, which has just celebrated its 25th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you and all my colleagues in the House join with me and Millie's husband Donald, her two sons, Edward and Alan, her two grandsons, Michael and Jeffrey and all her friends in commending her for her outstanding service.

Mr. Speaker, seldom will you find a citizen who is so giving of their time and so devoted to doing their very best in everything in which they are involved. Mildred Bird has served her community these many years and deserves our praise, our gratitude and our very warmest wishes for a happy and healthy retirement.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS HELPED "BUILD" AMERICA

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, today I want to pay tribute to a group that helped "build" America during the 1930's and 1940's—the Civilian Conservation Corps [CCC].

In April the CCC celebrates its 59th anniversary, and I'd like to ask my colleagues to mark this noteworthy occasion. Our Nation owes a debt of gratitude to this remarkable organization and the men who served in the CCC and helped build roads, dams, parks and buildings throughout our great Nation. The legacy of the CCC lives today, and their work and contributions will be evident for generations to come.

On April 5, 1933, during the historic "One Hundred Days" of Franklin Roosevelt's first term, the U.S. Congress enacted as part of the New Deal legislation the "Civilian Conservation Corps Relief and Reforestation Act.

The CCC was created as an emergency relief measure to alleviate high levels of youth unemployment. The CCC workforce had the task of mitigating the depletion of America's natural resources. In FDR's first statement about the CCC he proposed that it be "used in work, not interfering with normal employment and confining itself to forestry, the prevention of soil erosion, flood control and similar projects." By midsummer of its first year of existence, CCC had hired 300,000 unemployed young men who were working in 1,500 CCC camps throughout the country. During its peak year in 1935 the CCC employed a half million men located in 2,600 camps in all 48 States and U.S. territories—including 4 Tennessee camps.

Enrollees had to be unemployed single males between the ages of 18–25, and later included 225,000 World War II veterans. They earned $30 per week and were required to send $25 home to their families. CCC workers received room and board, clothing and educational opportunities.

The CCC: Built or preserved more than 1,000 national, State, county and city parks. Built 3,740 fire towers. Built 97,000 miles of truck roads. Spent more than 4 million man-days fighting fires. Planted more than 2 billion trees. Arrested erosion on more than 20,000 acres and spent more than 1 million man-days protecting life and property during the 1937 floods in New England and the Ohio and Mississippi River valleys.

The CCC: Restored man-made drainage systems which affected 84 million acres of agricultural land. Rescued more than a million sheep in the 1936–37 blizzards in Utah. And, taught more than 40,000 illiterates how to read and write.

The first Tennessee CCC camp opened in May, 1933 with the establishment of Camp Cordell Hull in Unicoi County.

For administrative purposes the CCC was divided into nine corps areas. Tennessee was part of the 4th Corps area, and was part of District C along with portions of western North Carolina and north Georgia, Alabama and Mississippi.

Approximately 70,000 Tennesseans served in the CCC in Tennessee and as far away as the west coast. By 1941 in Tennessee the CCC had built 98 lookout towers and houses; erected nearly 4,000 miles of forest telephone lines; built 1,496 miles of minor roads; constructed 387,208 check dams and planted over 36 million trees for erosion control; almost 27 million for reforestation and 554,457 pounds of hardwood seeds; spent 134,811 man-days fighting forest fires and another 122,033 man-days in fire prevention work.

CCC boys helped build the first State parks in Tennessee including Montgomery Bell, Meeman-Shelby Forest, Natchez Trace, Chickasaw, Pickett, Reelfoot, Frozen Head, Norris Dam, the Grundy County Lakes and Recreational Area [South Cumberland], Big Ridge, T.O. Fuller, Nathan Bedford Forest, Booker T. Washington, Harrison Bay, Cove Lake, Pickwich Landing and Cumberland Mountain. CCC work included building retaining walls, trail shelters, vacation cabins, benches and picnic tables, boat houses, contact stations, water systems and even dams for park lakes. At Norris Dam State Park and Big Ridge the CCC also engaged in historic preservation work.

The CCC legacy in America and in Tennessee is one of hard work, accomplishment and pride. At least 85 percent of the CCC employees went on to serve in World War II.

I believe the public service concept of CCC should be re-examined and could be utilized to help solve some of the domestic economic problems confronting our country today.

I want to thank Mr. Robert Griffin of Howenwald, TN, Mr. Cecil Flowers of the National Association of Civilian Conservation Corps Alumni in Jackson, TN, who helped me gather information about this outstanding group of people, and the authors of several articles about CCC that I used to prepare these remarks.

Mr. Speaker, today I ask my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives to join me in saluting and paying tribute to the thousands of Tennesseans who served in the CCC and to a group of young men whose contributions to our Nation went far beyond building roads and dams. These young men played an integral role in the history of our Nation and personified the American spirit of hard work, public service and pride.

A TRIBUTE TO HON. JOHN ANTON BLATNIK

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay homage to Congressman John Anton Blatnik, former representative of Minnesota's eight Congressional District who died on December 17, 1991. If I may echo the February 1974, words of Hubert H. Humphrey spoken upon the occasion of John Blatnik's retirement, "History has a way of shrinking to proper size the episodes which capture the public's attention for a fleeting moment. And it has a way of raising to proper size the acts of wisdom, of vision, and of courage." Long before Chairman Blatnik's death, American history began to construct a favorable perspective immortalizing this honest and decent man. Now that he has passed, I offer these words to help insure that the final perspective is true to form.

To those not from Minnesota, names such as Hubert Humphrey, Walter Mondale, and Eugene McCarthy, are more easily recognized. However, even those from Minnesota may not recall that when John Blatnik was first elected to the House in 1947, Hubert Humphrey was mayor of Minneapolis, Walter Mondale was a 20-year-old student at Macalester College, and Eugene McCarthy was a young economics professor at the College of St. Thomas. While each of these men contributed substantially to the betterment of the body politic, to this day none has acquired or exercised more power, nor had a more enduring impact on Minnesota or the Nation, than John Blatnik.

The son of an immigrant iron miner from Yugoslavia, he was a first-generation American. I can vividly remember John coming out to visit the fishing town of San Pedro in my congressional district. Like much of Chairman Blatnik's district, San Pedro has a strong Yugoslavian influence. My fondest memories involve the two of us traveling to various Slav community meetings in San Pedro and singing songs from the Yugoslavian homeland. While it was no small task for him to teach me, a Norwegian, Slav songs, I was always grateful for his patience. I am convinced it was from his visits to my district that I solidified the Slav vote in my district.

It was out of his immigrant upbringing, and his searing memories of the Great Depression, that he established his reputation as an extraordinary conciliator. As a newly elected Congressman in the early 1970's, I had the distinct pleasure of learning John Blatnik's superb legislative skills during his 3-year tenure as the chairman of the Committee on Public Works and Transportation. Never was his savvy more visible than in 1972, 3 years after I arrived, when Chairman Blatnik successfully crafted and guided into law, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. After suffering a heart attack during intensive deliberations over the bill, many believed the strain of this endeavor was the main contributor to his attack. However, characteristic of the man, he never quit. Thanks to his unending devotion, Americans are able to enjoy our Nation's water resources, free from the massive pollution so characteristic of the early 1970's.

Upon learning of John Blatnik's death, I, as true of all that knew him, was filled with a great sense of loss. For us, his name creates deep feelings of respect, admiration, and unending commitment to public service. Those that reside in the Eighth Congressional District of Minnesota, however, must feel the loss of this great leader much more. John Blatnik loved his district, and most importantly, loved the people that lived there. His long-time friend Hubert Humphrey once stated, "There are a lot of junior world savers around, but John has been a giant and a Santa Claus for his district." After John suffered a heart attack in the early 1970's, Senator Humphrey also offered his view of the cause when he remarked, "He worked his heart out for his constituents."

Mr. Speaker, public servants will come and go. Many we remember, some we will forget. John Anton Blatnik, we will never forget. In his memory I offer these fond words: "Praise be to God for the dedicated men and women who without fear or favor work for the health and welfare of mankind, who will not see the full fruition of their efforts in this lifetime, but, thank God, their works do follow them".

SANCTIONS AGAINST IRAQ SHOULD BE MAINTAINED UNTIL ALL KUWAITIS ARE RETURNED

HON. CURT WELDON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. WELDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform my colleagues about a most impressive and important group of people who were here in Washington last week. A Kuwaiti humanitarian delegation, made up of leading private citizens from all over Kuwait, has come to Washington to share their views about life in post-war Kuwait.

As chairman of the House Task Force on Kuwait, I have had the good fortune to enjoy close relationships with Kuwaiti Ambassador Al-Sabah, as well as with private groups and citizens in Kuwait. It was truly a privilege to meet with these individuals.

Let me say from the outset that this is a private, completely independent delegation with no ties at all to the ruling Al-Sabah family. Included in the delegation was the head of the Kuwaiti Sociologists Association, the Kuwaiti Medical Society, the Kuwaiti Accountants Association, the Kuwait Lawyers Society, the Kuwaiti Literary Association, the Kuwaiti Engineers Society, the Kuwaiti Pilots and Flight Engineers Society, the Kuwaiti Economists Society, the Kuwaiti Graduates Society, and the Kuwaiti General Laborers Union. These are the private sector leaders, a broad cross-section of Kuwaiti society. In fact, many of these men and women are active within nascent opposition political movements in Kuwait.

Yet they are not here in Washington to criticize the ruling family or score political points. Their primary concern, like all Kuwaitis, is the safe return of all prisoners of war still being held in Iraq. The Kuwait Association to Defend War Victims, which cosponsored the delegation, estimates that there are close to 2,000 Kuwaitis still being held in Iraqi prisons. The Association works closely with the International Red Cross to track the status of all POW's. These Kuwaitis have now been in Iraqi jails for over a year.

Last year I introduced House Resolution 217, which calls on Saddam to release immediately all Kuwaiti prisoners of war. The legislation mandates that all sanctions currently in place against Iraq be maintained until all Kuwaitis are returned. I would urge all my colleagues to co-sponsor this legislation, which promotes basic human rights and simple justice. For the sake of the thousands of Kuwaiti children whose families have been torn apart, I ask my friends on both sides of the aisle to lend their support to this important effort.

TRIBUTE TO LYUN JOON KIM

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor one of the world's great educators and champions of international understanding—Dr. Lyun Joon Kim, founder and chairman of the board of trustees of Hanyang University, Seoul, Korea. His contributions to religion, education, human rights and music have been recognized by many universities in Canada, France, Israel, Korea, Taiwan, and the United States, all of whom have conferred honorary degrees upon him.

An examination of the degrees he holds, honoris causa, from institutions of higher education in this country, attests to the breadth of his interests and accomplishments. From Shaw University in North Carolina and Southern Illinois University he has received doctorates of literature. These were a fitting recognition of leadership in education as a man who has been a major force in founding schools such as the Dong-A Polytechnic School, the Hanyang Engineering College, the Hanyang Technical College, the Hanyang Girls Junior and Senior High School, and the Hanyang Women's Junior College. They could also be said to commemorate his role as president and publisher of the daily Daihan Ilbo in Seoul from 1960–1973.

The University of Toledo granted him the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters in 1983. Dr. Lyun Joon Kim is the very embodiment of all that degree embodies. As a humanitarian he has awarded thousands of scholarships to Korean students. He has championed the poor and assisted those whose human rights have been abused. Since 1965, Dr. Kim has been chairman of the International Human Rights League of Korea, and since 1984, he has been president of the countrywide organization. He is a hero of his people because of his opposition during World War II to the Japanese attempts to take over the technical college which he founded.

If Dr. Kim had never engaged upon his remarkable life of public service, he still would deserve our tribute today because of his extraordinary musical genius. Central Michigan University is but one of those institutions which have conferred upon him the degree of doctor of music. He learned to play the violin at the age of 8. He has composed some 3,800 pieces of music earning him the title of the Schubert of Asia. His musical works have been presented at concerts held in Seoul and Chongju, Korea; Tokyo, Japan; Taipei, Taiwan; Bonn, Munich, Tubingen, Dusseldorf, Iserlohn, and Bochum, Germany; Tel Aviv in Israel; Rouen and Paris in France; and in the United States in Carnegie Hall and Atlanta, GA. Tubingen University at its 500th aniversary celebration in 1979, recognized Dr. Kim with the Outstanding Composition Award.

Throughout his life Dr. Kim's actions have been inspired by his deep commitment to Christianity. His deep faith has been recognized by the doctor of divinity degrees given him by Southwest Baptist University and Faith Theological Seminary. His religious conviction has been manifested through the sacred music he has composed and his lifelong work for Christian harmony. Since 1963, he has been the publisher of Kidok Kyo Sinmun—the Union Christian Press. In 1984, he was given the International Award by the National Religious Broadcasters in Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, in Dr. Lyun Joon Kim we have in one man a musical genius and one of the most venerable educators it has been my pleasure to honor. I am sure my colleagues will wish to join with me in wishing him many more fruitful years of service to humanity.

HOUSE SPENDING ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today, along with a number of my colleagues, I will be introducing the House Spending Accountability Act, a bill which would require that recorded votes be taken on priority spending bills. Congress must be held accountable for the money it spends. It is outrageous that last year the House passed billions in taxpayer dollars without recorded votes.

For example, last November, the House passed a $30 billion measure to re-fund the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation [FDIC]. This 437 page measure would protect deposits in commercial banks by granting the FDIC a $30 billion line of credit with the Treasury to cover losses in failed banks. And, how did this bill pass? By voice vote!

I was disgusted that the House would allow a bill of this magnitude to be approved without a recorded vote. It is no wonder the American people are fed up with the way Congress does business.

The House Spending Accountability Act would require a recorded vote on legislation that would make an appropriation, provide direct spending, legislation that doesn't require an appropriation, or authorize new credit authority, a line of credit from the Treasury.

Last year, six appropriation conference reports and two continuing resolutions, totaling $392.8 billion, passed by voice vote. In addition, the House approved by voice vote $64.2 billion in new credit and direct spending bills. It is time the House be held accountable to the taxpayers for the funds it spends.

THE 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY OF DR. AND MRS. WILL HAYES

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize an event that took place while this body was in recess for the holidays. Last New Year's Eve, two long-time constituents and dear friends, Will and Barbara Hayes, celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary in Santa Barbara.

Will and Barbara met in Hawaii while Will was instructing invasion survival tactics to military personnel for the Red Cross. After experiencing the bombing of Pearl Harbor, Will knew life would be different. He returned to California for the Christmas holidays, where he married Barbara at her parent's home in Fullerton on December 31, 1941. Barbara still jokes that Will married her on the last day of the year just to get the full year's marital tax deduction.

Will and Barbara Hayes have been exemplary citizens, dedicating much of their lives to community service in Santa Barbara. During World War II, Will was commissioned as an ensign in the Coast Guard, and at the end of the war, he accepted an assistant professor position at the University of California, Santa Barbara campus. Over his career, Will has been named college dean, faculty president, president of Rotary, foreman of the grand jury, and president of the board of trustees for the Santa Barbara Public Library. Barbara started the Humpty Dumpty Nursery School, which she directed for more than 20 years and has since become a Santa Barbara landmark. Their marriage has been blessed with four sons, all of whom have continued the family tradition of community.

Not only am I proud to include these outstanding people as my constituents, I am especially proud to include them among my friends. I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Will and Barbara Hayes a very happy anniversary, with many happy years to come.

RECOGNIZE CROATIA AND SLOVENIA AS INDEPENDENT STATES

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise and ask my colleagues to join me in urging the President to recognize the Republics of Croatia and Slovenia as independent states. It is high time that the United States joins the European Community in extending full diplomatic recognition to these two war-torn Republics.

With the Communist Serbian Government in control of the Federal Government, Slovenia declared its independence in June 1991. The following morning, the Communist Serbian-dominated Federal army invaded Slovenia. Upon declaring independence, Croatia was faced with the same consequence.

In keeping with our 200-year democratic traditions, the United States must assist these Republics as they strive to instill the democratic values which we cherish as their own. Our forefathers fought for the right of self-governance and liberty. Today the United States should help these Republics accomplish this task by extending the hand of diplomatic recognition. Time is of the essence. The Communist-dominated Serbian Army has already encroached on over one-third of Croatian territory and has shown no intention of pulling back.

The world has witnessed the Federal army join forces with Serbian guerrillas in an effort to destroy Croatia. This is an army that was originally placed on duty as a peace-keeping

force. However, according to reports by the Helsinki Watch, Communist Serbian forces have committed outrageous acts of aggression and human rights violations against Croatians.

Helsinki Watch reports: "The Serbian-led Federal army is accused of the summary execution of civilians; the indiscriminate and disproportionate use of force against civilian targets; the torture and mistreatment of detainees; disappearances and the taking of hostages; and the forced displacement and resettlement of civilians." Further, Serbia violated the 15th cease-fire agreement reached under U.N. auspices by shelling Croatian towns. It appears that Serbia will not cease fighting until Croatia is destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, the United States must take a stand. In the interest of peace and stability in the Balkans, and for the cause of furthering both democracy and human rights, our Government must recognize the independence of Croatia and Slovenia.

COMEDIAN JAY LENO TO CHEER UP THE UNEMPLOYED

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to stand up before you to commend comedian Jay Leno for doing his part to help the unemployed in these difficult times. Mr. Leno will be performing four free shows for the out-of-work at the Zaines comedy clubs in Chicago this February 13 and 14. In doing so, Mr. Leno will be bringing some sunshine into the lives of the unemployed.

Today, Americans everywhere are finding themselves out of work. Since the start of the recession in July 1990, 1.9 million jobs have been lost. Last year, 25 million people—20 percent of the workforce—were unemployed at some time. Job cuts now average 2,600 a day. Last month, for instance, General Motors, Xerox, and IBM released 100,000 employees from their payrolls.

According to an Associated Press poll, two out of three Americans say the economy is getting worse but think the Government can do something about it. As Members of Congress, we cannot ignore this plea for help.

As a comedian, Mr. Leno is doing his part by giving unemployed Americans the humor they need to escape their problems if only for a moment. We should be inspired by Mr. Leno's efforts and do our part as lawmakers by helping the unemployed get back to work.

FIGHTING TO PRESERVE THE 169TH

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, I learned that the Connecticut National Guard will lose 909 authorized positions by September 1, 1992, and will lose another 2,054 in 1993, according to orders recently issued by the National Guard Bureau, as part of its Operation Quicksilver plan. A sizable reduction was expected, and generally regarded as unavoidable and a sign of more peaceful times. But no one imagined that a decision of such importance to our communities would be blatantly unfair and disregard the service tradition of historic units like the 169th.

Under the current proposal, by 1993 Connecticut will have lost 49 percent of its force, while the average cut nationwide will be only 19 percent. While every American can understand that in times of budgetary constraints and a reduced threat of military strike we should make every effort to reduce U.S. troop strength, it is outrageous that the National Guard Bureau ignored key issues such as regional equity, excellence of service, and history when proposing these cuts.

Among the specific units targeted for elimination in 1992 is the 1st Battalion, 169th Infantry which currently has 590 soldiers serving in Manchester, New Britain, Danielson, Enfield, and Rockville, CT. The 169th was first called up by Commander-In-Chief George Washington in 1777 and helped repel the Redcoats from Saratoga. It later distinguished itself again in the War of 1812, The Spanish-American War in 1898, and in 1917 was dispatched to France to battle the German Army.

Our units rank high in readiness and mission accomplishment, as is evident in recent evaluations and statistical information. In May of last year, the Connecticut National Guard was selected as one of the finalists in the nationwide Army Community of Excellence Program for 1991 and sent delegates to the Pentagon on May 23, 1991, to collect the award. I am proud of the history of excellent service the 169th has provided on behalf of the State of Connecticut, and I will be saddened to see its proud tradition come to an abrupt end.

No one is asking the National Guard Bureau to make an exception for Connecticut's National Guard. Instead we in the Connecticut Delegation are calling for a more equitable troop reduction plan, knowing that Connecticut is prepared to assume its fair share of troop reductions. Our great State of Connecticut remains prepared to support the President and the Secretary of Defense in their efforts to act responsibly in the face of reduced military threats and urgent budgetary pressures. But we will pursue every avenue to reverse the unfair, ill-advised action recently taken.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION TO EXTEND HEALTH BENEFIT COVERAGE TO RECENTLY UNEMPLOYED INDIVIDUALS

HON. DAN GLICKMAN

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. GLICKMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 [COBRA], requires employers to allow former employees to continue to purchase their health benefits under their former plan for 18 to 36 months after the end of their employment. The former employee pays the full cost of the coverage, including a 2 percent fee to cover the employer's administrative costs.

Recently, I hosted a town hall meeting addressing health care. Several of my constituents mentioned that because of the current economic problems it has become difficult to secure a replacement job, and soon their option to purchase health benefits under COBRA would expire. I do not believe it is right for these people to be both jobless and unprotected in the event they need medical benefits.

With this in mind, I am introducing legislation today to extend COBRA coverage to 60 months. The intent of Congress enacting the continuation of health benefits provision in COBRA was to ensure no American went without health coverage while between jobs. The strong economy at that time caused Congress to believe 18 months would be sufficient for a terminated employee to find new work.

But the current tough economic times are keeping a greater number of people unemployed for longer than 18 months. Since Congress has extended unemployment benefits, and may do so again in the coming weeks, we also should extend the amount of time former employees may hold onto health coverage while unemployed.

This bill is a small, but important first step in helping our constituents survive these tough economic times, and will provide the security of continued health insurance to those who do not have the security of a job. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO JOSÉ FERRER

HON. JOSÉ E. SERRANO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I rise today to mourn the death of José Ferrer, one of Puerto Rico's most gifted sons. Mr. Ferrer brought much joy to the lives of people all over the world through his rich, diverse artistic talents. He was world-renowned for his unique acting, directing, and producing abilities on stage as well as on screen.

Born in Santurce, PR, Mr. Ferrer's interest in show business began while he was a student of architecture at Princeton University. Following his graduation in 1933, Mr. Ferrer worked both on-stage and behind the scenes with small theatrical companies in New York. Soon, he was performing on Broadway.

Mr. Ferrer's outstanding work in the theater, in his capacity as actor, director, producer, and even author, brought him much deserved acclaim. In 1952 alone, his outstanding performance in, and direction of, several plays won him an Antoinette Perry (Tony) Award, a Donaldson Award, the Page One Award for dramatic art from the New York Newspaper Guild, and the Variety New York Drama Critics Poll for directing and acting. Mr. Ferrer won both a Tony Award and a Donaldson Award several years earlier for his widely acclaimed stage performances in "Cyrano de Bergerac" and "Othello," respectively. Mr. Ferrer also was awarded the American Academy of Arts and Letters Gold Medal for Speech in 1949.

Mr. Ferrer's artistic abilities were not limited to the stage. In 1948 he appeared in his first film, for which he received a Motion Picture Academy Award nomination. Mr. Ferrer was actually awarded the Oscar 2 years later for his magnificent performance in "Cyrano de Bergerac." Here again, in the film industry as on Broadway, Mr. Ferrer proved himself to be an exceptional actor, director, and producer whose work was highly acclaimed all over the world. In 1950 he was awarded the Linguaphone Institute Annual Award for diction in films and 2 years later he received the Federation of Motion Picture and Stage Actors of Cuba Annual Award for Acting.

Mr. Ferrer was, and his memory will continue to be, a great source of inspiration to everyone, but particularly to those individuals with mixed cultural backgrounds. Although Mr. Ferrer lived in mainland America for the greater part of his life, he was heavily influenced by his Hispanic heritage. This cultural combination resulted in a unique artistic style which characterized Mr. Ferrer's work and distinguished it from that of other artists. As Mr. Ferrer himself once said, "I am an American who is in many ways unlike an American." The product of two cultures, Mr. Ferrer demonstrated that both influences could be successfully balanced and combined so as to enable an individual to contribute in an entirely unique way to society.

In addition to obtaining numerous awards praising his individual artistic work, Mr. Ferrer was the first actor to receive two very prestigious awards commending his contributions to the arts as a whole. In 1967, Mr. Ferrer was awarded a plaque from the Organizations of American States "as a symbol of New World culture whose notable dramatic talent and distinguished contribution to the theater have greatly increased its prestige," and in 1985, he received the National Medal of Arts from President Reagan. Mr. Ferrer was an internationally celebrated Hispanic whose dedication to, and success in, the work he loved qualify him as an exemplary role model for Hispanics everywhere.

This remarkable Puerto Rican will always be remembered for his nearly six decades of invaluable contributions to the dramatic arts. Although Mr. Ferrer is no longer with us, films such as "Moulin Rouge," "The Caine Mutiny," "Joan of Arc," and "Ship of Fools," not to mention the unforgettable "Cyrano the Bergerac," will allow us to relive our enjoyment of his work and enable future generations to experience the immense talent of Mr. Ferrer. Mr. Speaker, please join me today in paying tribute to an exceptionally gifted and outstanding member of the Puerto Rican community whose death constitutes a significant loss for us all, José Ferrer.

HONORING HOUSE PAGE MICHAEL CONNORS

HON. GARY A. CONDIT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. CONDIT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to praise one of my constituents, Michael Connors, who served as a House Page over the last 6 months. He was part of the page class which departed on January 24, 1992.

This fine young man from Turlock, CA served this House honorably and with distinction. He accepted every challenge that was presented to him with eagerness. During the latter part of his tenure with us, he was assigned to the Democratic cloakroom where he worked tirelessly around the clock, especially during late November, to make sure that Members were being served. It was always a pleasure to see him in the cloakroom or to talk to him on the phone concerning floor activities. I will miss Michael, as will the members of my staff who came to rely on him for getting messages to me. We practically considered him as part of our staff.

I wish this young man the best of wishes as he continues his education. I am confident that he will make a valuable contribution to our society in whatever endeavor he chooses to pursue.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION RESTORING INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 28, 1992

Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, tonight, President Bush proposes his solution to stimulate the economy. Today, I am introducing legislation to provide an investment tax credit which will go a long way toward that goal.

My bill would allow a 10 percent tax credit for increases in investment by businesses. Most importantly, equipment qualifying for the credit must be made in the U.S.A. In addition, the credit would be available only if the equipment is new. Furthermore, the investment must be in equipment that is both an integral part of manufacturing or production, as well as an increase in investment and not merely replacement of existing capital stock. The time has come to restore America's manufacturing base.

Mr. Speaker, my bill will also provide a tax credit to stimulate the sale of real estate held by the Resolution Trust Corporation or the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Billions of taxpayer dollars are wasted while the Federal Government sits on this idle property. A temporary 5 percent tax credit is available to any RTC or FDIC property that is used in manufacturing or production.

Mr. Speaker, the time has come for action, not rhetoric. I think that solving this recession will require us to get back to the basics—and make fundamental, basic decisions about our economy. It was based on manufacturing—production—hard work. Consumer spending will not be the answer to this recession. Restoring America's manufacturing base will.

At this point in the RECORD I am submitting a technical description.

SUMMARY OF DONNELLY INVESTMENT TAX CREDIT PROPOSAL

The bill would allow a 10 percent tax credit for increases in investment by businesses. A credit is a direct reduction in tax liability; a taxpayer with $5,000 in tax liability with $10,000 in qualified investments could reduce his tax to $4,000 because of the credit.

The credit would be available only if the equipment: (1) was made in the United States; (2) was new property for the taxpayer; (3) was an integral part of manufacturing, production or farming; (4) was an increase in investment and not merely replacement of existing capital stock.

The credit would generally not be available for real estate (unless it is RTC/FDIC property, as described below).

The credit would be temporary, and would expire after December 31, 1995.

An additional 5 percent credit would be available for real estate owned by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation or the Resolution Trust Corporation if: (1) the property is used as an integral part of manufacturing; production or farming; (2) the property is not owned by an owner, director, or substantial shareholder of a failed bank or thrift; (3) The FDIC or RTC (as the case may be) certifies that the availability of the credit does not negatively effect real estate prices in the surrounding community; and (4) The FDIC or RTC (as the case may be) certifies that it is not possible to sell the property without the credit.

If the taxpayer disposed of the property prior to the end of its useful life, a portion of the tax credit claimed would have to be repaid to the Federal Government.