HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, April 18, 1994*

The House met at 10:30 a.m., and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, DC,
April 18, 1994.

I hereby designate the Honorable ROMANO L. MAZZOLI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING BUSINESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Friday, February 11, 1994, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member except the majority and minority leaders limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

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

THE BURDENS OF ILLEGAL IMMIGRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, crime and deficit reduction are top issues. Last Friday, millions of Americans wrote checks to Uncle Sam to meet their Federal tax obligations. Families are working harder, paying more and getting less for their money. With the Federal Government growing ever bigger and spending far beyond our means every year—State and local governments and American taxpayers are increasingly being asked to pick up the slack—to find the resources to pay for the demands and shortcomings of Federal policies. Now, backed into a corner by pressing needs and an irresponsible Federal Government, States are beginning to fight back. In Florida, the Governor has filed a lawsuit against the Federal Government, to recoup millions of dollars spent by the State to pick up the pieces of our failed national immigration policy. This is not a partisan issue—the Governor of Florida is a member of the President's own Democratic Party. The fact is that Florida cannot afford to pay the estimated $884 million annual bill for the 345,000 illegal aliens living within its borders, using its health services, attending its schools, and crowding its prisons. In our State, we spend more than $50 million a year to keep more than 3,000 illegal criminal aliens in prison—sapping critical resources needed to ensure that dangerous criminals are kept locked up. It is clearly the responsibility of the Federal Government to protect U.S. borders and control immigration. Yet, nationwide, there are an estimated 4 million illegal immigrants living within our borders. Since the early 1980's, Federal officials charged with controlling these borders have openly admitted failure. Today, the situation is desperate and its consequences are enormous. According to the INS, 85 percent of all undocumented aliens live in six States—Florida, California, New York, Texas, Illinois, and New Jersey—causing tremendous budgetary pressures. Although Congress in 1986 authorized the Federal Government to reimburse States for this ongoing immigration emergency, to date the State of Florida has received no such funds. This is yet another Federal promise left unfilled. In fact, not only is the Federal Government abdicating its financial responsibility to the States, but it is now cutting back on the national border-control services it already supplies. Last week, we were told that INS is slashing its finger-print verifications of potential immigrants. The INS calls this $3 million service an expensive, labor-intensive process. This is truly penny-wise and pound-foolish. What are the relative costs of this commonsense screening program when compared with the cost of the World Trade Center bombing and other violent acts by criminals who make it through the leaky sieve of U.S. borders?

This week the House will continue deliberation of an omnibus crime bill. But, as we discuss the need for more prisons, more cops on the streets, more neighborhood programs and tougher sentencing, we have got to come to terms with the cost of illegal immigration and its serious impact on our criminal justice system. The majority leadership shut out a key amendment to establish a criminal alien tracking center, beef up deportation procedures and crack down on criminal aliens. This is a missed opportunity to bring the Federal Government back into partnership with the States in managing immigration. Yes, we will have the chance to debate whether we need 6,000 additional border patrol agents, and we will have the chance to reaffirm our commitment to the 1986 law that mandates Federal reimbursement to the States for some of the costs of illegal and criminal immigration. But before anyone gets the wrong impression that the Federal Government is finally stepping up to its responsibility, keep in mind that the crime bill, for all its good intentions and promises, comes to the House floor without a funding mechanism. Once again, it seems, the Federal Government is failing to back up its policies with the resources needed to get the job done.

Americans are compassionate people whose first instinct is to come to the aid of those in need. Our Nation is still viewed as a haven, a land of opportunity for people around the world. But we are also a Nation of finite resources, and the Federal Government's blank check has bounced. Everyone will have a reminder of that every April 15 from now to eternity. But I say to my colleagues, "When you send in your check to the Government make sure it doesn't bounce. That's against the law."

THE TAILHOOK CONSEQUENCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I take to the floor to talk a bit about a New York Times editorial that I will later put in the RECORD when we go into official session. This is about what the other body did recently, and that is allow Admiral Kelso to have two additional stars as he retired as head of the Navy operations. The New York Times editorial takes this to task saying that one more time the Senate Armed Services Committee has joined the old boys network, that it protects top military brass no matter what and really holds them above accountability. Part of this goes to the Tailhook decision, which was a very, very painful one. When Tailhook happened, Mr. Speaker, the civilian leadership of the Navy stepped down, understanding the captain-of-the-ship principle better than the one who was in uniform and supposedly

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

came from the captain-of-the-ship tradition.

□ 1040

The civilian leadership stepped down, and the gentlemen who were on the military side continued to have all sorts of problems with Tailhook. As we know, two Navy investigations under the admiral both had to be derailed, and they finally had to bring in investigators from the outside.

One of the frustrating things is that people keep wanting to ignore what the investigators from the outside said. This really is not about sexual harassment; this is about sexual assault. Assault is very different than harassment. Harassment is basically words. Assault is really going after someone.

This is about 15 fellow officers who attended this convention and, because they were female, were sexually assaulted. This is about 87 people in all who attended this convention and were assaulted, 6 of whom were men, but they happened to be from the other service, the Air Force.

Tailhook is a command problem because everyone knew this had been going on for a very long time, and if we look at the decision which came down through military justice, the judge put in the record the long histories of memos going to the command saying "Tailhook is out of control. What are we going to do?" And they answered in silence.

Not only did they answer in silence, but the top command went to Tailhook. The top command went to Tailhook, and there were all sorts of sightings of the admiral, who is about to get a promotion, at that Tailhook party. There were all sorts of devastating things in the Navy military decision, and the military decision said that none of the people should be accountable because anyone at this party must have thought it was OK. Since they saw an admiral with four stars there and they saw the Secretary of the Navy attended.

Now, I go back to where I started. This is not about whether or not the person was a nice person. I am sure they were very nice people. But it goes to the very point that women's issues never were taken very seriously. They tried to cover up the investigation twice, and it had to be taken away from the Navy under his command. The civilian side understands it and resigned in embarrassment. We go forward and see that in the post-Tailhook environment nothing has really changed. They changed the rules, but they have not changed the enforcement, as we had hearings in the Committee on Armed Forces about many women who have continued to be attacked and nothing really happened except maybe the woman got put in a mental hospital for 3 days or something.

So it really has not changed. For policymakers to have in front of them all this evidence and for them to say, "Well, we're going to cover for the top command," that sends a very poor message to the lower ranks. We should really have justice for all in this society or we had better be very honest about it and admit that we do not.

So I salute the New York Times for this editorial.

I certainly hope that some of my sisters who moved to the other body will take this up, and I hope there is a raging fight on the Senate floor so we can see how many people really feel that there should be a promotion for an admiral who had all this happen under his command and never seemed to be able to get it under control.

Mr. Speaker, until we send this message, no one will get it under control because the message will be, "Well, women are important, and we can throw some words around, but we aren't really going to do anything about it."

CRIMINALS, NOT VICTIMS MUST BEAR THE COST OF CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. THOMAS] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMAS of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to talk a little about crime. Crime is on our agenda in the House this week.

Crime is on the agenda of most Americans. Even in my State of Wyoming, where we are far from the inner city, where we are far from population areas, crime is important. It is important because we have crime in rural areas. It is important because crime from urban areas begins to move in from urban areas to rural areas.

I want to talk about crime, but I hope that is not all we do in the Congress this week, is talk about crime. I hope we do not just talk endlessly and come forth with a bill that really does not do much. I hope we do not just talk tough and walk away from it.

We are looking at a bill that does not have any money. We are looking at one that does not deal with truth in sentencing. We are looking at one that does not redefine appeals, endless appeals. We are looking at one that does not put 100,000 officers on the street. We are looking at one that provides for racial quotas in terms of the death penalty. We are looking at one that has $8 million in it for social programs, one that is not tough on crime.

It seems to me there is a very basic fundamental issue here, and that is that caring for citizens and protecting citizens is a fundamental basic issue of government. We can argue about a lot of the things that Government does or does not do, whether they should do it, whether it can best be done in the private sector or in other ways, but protecting citizens is clearly a function of government at all levels.

This is a crime bill that tends to talk tough, but then to shift away to causes. We are not talking here about welfare programs, we are not talking about education programs, we are talking about crime programs. We are not talking about excuses for crime, whether someone has been rejected in their early childhood or discriminated against or whether there has been boredom or a lack of training. We are talking here about getting a bridle on crime. Our emphasis should be on putting the price of crime on the criminal, not on the victim.

Habeas corpus, it seems to me, and the idea of endless appeals is one of the most difficult problems.

It is interesting. We talked about this when I was in the Wyoming legislature, and we were told—and I think it is true—that the cost of the death penalty, the cost of executing the criminal, is higher than the cost of life imprisonment. Why? Because of endless, year-after-year appeals, and the legal costs that go with it.

We can change this. We ought to change it. This bill does not. On the contrary, the bill that is before the House provides for an endless appeal process, and any new policy made by the Supreme Court would be basis for an additional appeal, an endless one.

Racial quotas: Would you like to be a victim of a crime, a murder, a crime against your family, and have the judge say, "Well, I'm sorry. Because the perpetrator does not fit into the racial quota for this, there will be a life sentence instead of the death penalty"? It does not seem to me that is appropriate at all.

Prisons: We are talking about building prisons. This bill provides for $3 billion. The alternative provides for $10 billion.

About 95 percent of the crimes come under the jurisdiction of State and local agencies, as they should. This alternative proposition provides for $10 billion to be worked in cooperation with States in grants, States that would agree to have truth in sentencing or 85 percent of the sentence served, which is far beyond what we have now, not an unfunded mandate but, rather, a cooperative arrangement with States.

Finally, it seems to me we have to be very careful of some basic things. One of them is not to federalize the criminal system. The most effective crime fighting is going to take place in communities, in neighborhoods, in cities, and in States. There is a clear definition, and a proper one, of what the Federal role ought to be and the kinds of crimes the Federal Government ought to be involved in, but the preponder-

ance of safety for our citizens will be carried on by State and local agencies, and we need to help them, not restrict them and not federalize them.

A good deal of criticism arises about government, particularly the Federal Government. It seems to me it comes from promises that are never carried out. It comes from tough talk and very little action.

Mr. Speaker, we should not let that happen. We need truth in sentencing, but we also need truth in promising. Let us come forward with a tough crime bill that deals with crime and causes the cost of crime to be on the criminal and not on the victim.

□ 1050

DEMOCRATS' CRIME BILL A CRIME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LINDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. LINDER. Mr. Speaker, we are again presented with an administration that talks to the right and walks to the left on all bills that we have seen. The language that this administration uses does not match with the words that they write in their bills.

You will recall the very first commercial that Candidate Clinton put out during the campaign was to end welfare as we know it, to get tough on welfare, get people out working for themselves.

Again, that rang well in the ears of the electorate. That is something the Americans have been thinking and worrying about for some time. We spent $5 trillion since 1965 on the poor, and the poverty rate has gone from 12.8 to 14.1 percent.

What has the administration written on this welfare reform? Not one word. Indeed, the liberals on the Democrat side will not let welfare reform come to the fore, because those folks on those plantations are their voters.

Last year on the budget, the President you will recall during the campaign said we are going to have a middle class tax cut. In the last debate, he said if any of my proposals would require any tax increase, I will drop them.

Then he said in December, well, I have been surprised by a budget deficit that was much larger than I thought, and we are going to have to have the largest tax increase in history. However, it will only affect the top 1.2 percent of the income earners.

Well, he needs to talk to those people who are retired and making $40,000 a year and who have got a 70 percent increase in the taxes on their Social Security. I am sure they do not consider themselves in the top 1.2 percent, but they got the tax increase. He needs to talk to the truck driver who makes a living going across our roads, who pays 4.3 cents per gallon more in new taxes every day.

On health care the President made it clear he was going to provide everybody with universal coverage that you cannot lose, lifetime security in health care. He was going to improve your choices, improve the quality of care, and reduce the cost.

Well, words mean things. Words are the currency of this profession, and you cannot just keep lying to the American people. We learned you do not listen to what they say; you read what they write.

When the President was interviewed on CBS by Paula Zahn, she said could someone go to their own doctor and pay them with their own cash? The President said of course you can. That is not what his bill says. You may do it, but you would be guilty of bribery, and the doctor who takes the money is guilty of a felony worth a $10,000 fine.

The most recent example, of course, is the crime bill we are working on on the floor of the House at this time. The President promised to expand the number of crimes for which capital punishment can obtain, and they brag about that. But in fact, the procedural roadblocks put into this bill make it unlikely that anyone will ever be put to death for any Federal crime again.

The President promised to get tougher on habeas corpus, the endless appeals, to shorten them. In fact, as the speaker before me said, they are dramatically lengthened. We even add an additional government-paid lawyer for those appealing.

The President promised in a press conference last September and in his State of the Union that he is going to endorse three strikes and you are out, three violent felonies and you are in prison forever. Well, the bill says that, but procedurally it makes it virtually impossible to apply to anyone, and, indeed, of the thousands and thousands of people in prison on Federal charges today, only 500 would be eligible for the difficult procedure to use the three strikes and you are out.

It has been said that somewhere between 15 and 25 percent, in some states, of all the people in our Federal prisons are there as illegal aliens. Did we get tough on that and send them home? No, we do not address that.

The President did not do one thing in his crime bill about addressing the root cause of crime, which is not insecurity and lack of self-confidence. It is drugs, neighborhood use of drugs. The communicable disease spread by user to user in our neighborhoods, we do not address that.

It is obvious to everyone who looks at this problem, and it is repeated over and over, that 6 percent of Americans commit 70 to 80 percent of all crimes. Those are studies that go back as far as 1945.

Are we taking them off the streets? The way you do that is to build prisons or, even better yet, take these hundreds and hundreds of military bases we are shutting down and turn them into boot camps with fences around them. They have eating and sleeping facilities. Take the repeat offenders off the streets.

The President provides $3 billion in his crime bill to build prisons and $8 million for social welfare programs. $8 billion of pork that failed last year in the stimulus package, 8 percent of which will be handed out by the President and the administration themselves to cities and mayors that they choose to help. Nothing but payoffs, Indeed, some of the programs to be used in that $8 billion are self-esteem courses, removal of graffiti, and, indeed, even the 100,000 officers that were promised turns out to be 50,000 officers, and they do not even have to be police officers. Many of them will be social workers.

Ladies and gentlemen, the biggest crime we are facing today is this bill. It is a crime what they have written.

CRIME BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. SMITH, is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last July the Nation was shocked when James Jordan, the father of basketball great Michael Jordan, was shot by hoodlums after pulling his car over at a rest stop.

What made the murder even more outrageous was the fact that the two have been charged with committing the murder should never had been on the streets in the first place.

One had a record of fourteen burglary, forgery, and larceny charges, most of which had never come to trial. In fact, he was awaiting trial in August for bashing the skull of a 61-year-old convenience store clerk. The second had taken an axe to the head of a classmate 3 years earlier in a fight over a girl.

That predators like these should roam our streets, free to terrorize law-abiding citizens, is a national tragedy. That they should be able to do so even after passing through the criminal justice system—which doesn't have the resources to prosecute them or the jails to hold them—is also a national disgrace.

Since 1960 the population of the United States has risen about 40 percent. In that same period of time the rate of violent crime has shot up by 500 percent. We now have a higher crime rate than any other developed country in the world.

These stark statistics illustrate numerically what every American who

has ever been a victim probably felt upon hearing of Mr. Jordan's death. Violent crime in this country is simply out of control, and the old solutions aren't working.

Ask any police officer why criminals seem to operate with impunity and you'll probably find out it is because most have little fear of getting caught or doing any real time in prison.

Statistics bear them out. Washington, DC for instance, does not even have the resources to fully investigate all of the hundreds of murders that happen here every year, much less bring them to conviction. Their conviction rate is about one in four, and even then the average murderer spends less than 6 years in prison.

The first step in deterring crime is restoring the legitimate fear of punishment. Punishment that fits the crime.

The Republican crime bill would have done this by putting the Federal Government shoulder-to-shoulder with States, cites and counties to build a national system of regional prisons through cooperative agreements. To be eligible for 50 percent matching funds to build these prisons, States would have to enact truth-in-sentencing laws, pre-trial detention laws, and mandatory minimum sentences for violent and repeat offenders.

The Republican plan would also have enacted stiff new sentences to protect children, women's and victims' rights, and crack down on terrorism, and gangs. It would have provided $2 billion in grants to cities and counties to hire 20,000 more police officers, and more grants to school districts to buy security equipment. And since almost one-quarter of Federal prisoners are illegal aliens, the Republican plan would also have streamlined the process of deporting convicted criminal aliens, and beefed up the Border Patrol to keep criminal aliens out before they get here.

The Republican plan would have done all these things, but as is so often the case in Congress, it won't be allowed to because of a Democrat majority as afraid of Republican bills as Americans are of criminals.

Instead of spending this week debating a real crime bill, a Republican crime bill, the House will busy itself with a weak crime bill that reflects the administration's lack of commitment to the issue. The President has never sent a crime package to Congress.

Instead of an administration crime bill, a we have an administration budget that cuts the funds for drug enforcement and prison construction. Instead of an administration commitment on crime, we have a Surgeon General who talks about the legalization of drugs and an Attorney General who is making it harder to convict child pornographers. The administration's police care is sauntering to the crime scene with the siren off, the lights dark, and in reverse.

Not only will there be no Republican crime bill, but their will be precious few Republican amendments. There will be no provisions against criminal aliens in spite of the fact that America has criminal aliens. I offered an amendment that would have comprehensively addressed this problem. the Democrats unanimously rejected it.

Perhaps Democrats were afraid that some group would have been offended. Well I know that one group would have been offended by my amendment: criminals. I can assure you that they were against my amendment. They opposed it because it said if you're an alien and you're a criminal, then you're going to jail, then you're going home, and you're not coming back. The Democrats opposed it because they though it might win.

Americans are outraged by criminals on their streets and revolving doors on their prisons. They have begged Congress to send help. The Republicans' crime bill would have sent America "Dirty Harry."; the Democrats' crime bill is going to send them the smurfs.

□ 1100

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). Pursuant to clause 12, rule I, the House will stand in recess until 12 noon.

Accordingly, (at 11 a.m.) the House stood in recess until 12 noon.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI) at 12 noon.

PRAYER

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

You have created us as one people, O gracious God, and we share together in the hopes and fears that touch the human community. Yet, O God, we know that our unity is fragmented and our solidarity can be shattered and we do not witness to the wholeness and harmony that is Your gift to us. With all our differing circumstances and backgrounds and situations, may we hold strong to the high purposes to which we have been called, and express in our words and deeds our shared message of faith and hope and love. Bless all Your people, O God, this day and every day. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT] will please come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT 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.

TWO COLORADANS AMONG VICTIMS OF AIR FORCE DOWNING IN IRAQ

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, as a Coloradan, I rise with a very heavy heart today because of the 26 young people who were killed when the Air Force downed the helicopters. Two of those young people were from Colorado.

These two young people were very, very special, and it has been a very hard weekend for people in my State to deal with. The first was a young man named Mark Ellner. He was 22 years old. He was an absolute straight "A" student, a total perfectionist, and he really felt he was doing something to make a great difference in the world. He also showed up a playfulness that some of us in the West show that people do not understand who are outside the West, and that is that even though he was a straight "A" student and very serious about everything else, he liked to dress up like Elvis Presley every now and then. So he had a very human side to him, and he was thrilled to be over there trying to help in a humanitarian mission, because he felt he would learn a lot and be able to serve. I am sure he felt that this would probably be the last thing that would ever happen to him in that theater.

The other young man was a 33-year-old from Rifle named Rick Robinson. He was in the Special Forces as a medic, and he again had been thrilled at the privilege of being there, to go over there and help.

I think we have many questions we want to ask about all of this, and I certainly hope the Armed Services Investigations Committee gets to the bottom of the questions that just do not seem to be answerable, the questions on how this could ever happen when it seemed almost foolproof and it seemed that it could not possibly happen.

I think it is also part of our learning about how we are to perform tasks in a humanitarian mission mode rather than the normal military mission mode

and what the differences are and what all of that means.

To the families and to all my fellow Coloradans, this is indeed very, very sorrowful news, and we certainly hope that their families and their friends realize they did make a tremendous contribution, and that helping in that very difficult area in Project Comfort or Provide Comfort for the Kurdish refugees was indeed a very, very important mission.

CAVEAT EMPTOR

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, the President has been logging thousands of miles and thousands of dollars on Air Force One—attempting once again to sell his health plan to skeptical Americans. Today it's Milwaukee. Some people see the President as a master salesman who could get us to buy just about anything, but the polls actually show his health care plan just is not selling. Determined to reverse their public relations disaster, the White House now has a new strategy. They have repackaged the Clinton health care plan with a glitzy new sales pitch that is short on details, loose on facts and long on warm and fuzzy, feel-good rhetoric. Remember the time-honored phrase caveat emptor—let the buyer beware? Well, Mr. Speaker, more and more Americans are becoming aware to beware because they now know there are better choices than the Clinton health plan.

CHANGE THE BURDEN OF PROOF IN IRS TAX CASES

(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, I ask the Members to check this out. Hector Alva and Ray Alva are brothers. Now, Ray Alva owes the IRS almost $200,000.

Hector Alva has a small business. He owns a couple pieces of farm equipment, and he hires 150 farm workers to do custom farm service work.

The IRS shows up and takes Hector Alva's equipment. Hector Alva says, "My brother owes you money, not me."

The IRS says, "Hector, prove it."

He says, "You're taking my equipment without even giving me notice. This is illegal."

They said, "Hector, prove it. You don't look like an American businessman, and we don't think you can own that expensive equipment. Prove it, Hector. Prove it, Hector."

Mass murderers do not have to prove it, but they say, "Prove it, Hector Alva. You don't look like you could own such equipment."

Shame, Congress. It is time to change the burden of proof in tax cases. Before the IRS comes out and takes anybody's property and accuses them of fraud or wrongdoing, the IRS should have to prove it, and a taxpayer should be innocent until proven guilty. After all, mass murderers are treated that way.

Think about it. I ask the Members to sign Discharge Petition No. 12 and help me. This is H.R. 3261, Discharge Petition No. 12, and I ask for this help because I say to the Congress that I do not know who they represent anymore.

THE COOPER PLAN

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

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, according to the CBO, the Cooper version of health reform will cost the taxpayers $125 billion more than Mr. Cooper first anticipated.

As the American people pay their taxes tomorrow, I urge them to think about the implications of even more taxes.

Clearly, the Cooper solution is the wrong answer to the health care reform question.

If the Cooper plan is bad and the Clinton plan is worse, what is the best way to cure our health care crisis?

House Republicans have an approach to health care that will not cause the taxpayers heartburn, that will not inflate our deficit, that will not limit doctor choice, and that will not hurt our health care quality.

This plan will allow folks to take their health care plans with them if they change jobs, increase access to all who want quality health care insurance, and eliminate preexisting conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the Cooper and Clinton plans are dead on arrival. Support the best approach to health care reform. Support the Michel plan.

CESAR E. CHAVEZ: A GREAT AMERICAN CIVIL RIGHTS LEADER

(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, Cesar E. Chavez was one of America's greatest civil rights leaders. This week, thousands of people across the country who were touched by the life of Chavez remember him on the 1 year anniversary of his death, April 23, 1993. Today I am introducing a House joint resolution to establish "Cesar E. Chavez Day" on March 31, 1995, so that on his birthday this Nation may honor a man who dedicated his life to empowering people to free themselves from oppression.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the importance of sharing Cesar Chavez' history so that all Americans can see the results that are possible by working for justice through nonviolence in their communities. Through his commitment to nonviolent social action, Cesar Chavez brought dignity, respect, self-worth and inspiration to millions of farmworkers, students, other Americans and people throughout the world. Chavez dedicated his life to helping the poor and oppressed obtain livable standards of housing and food, and safe working conditions.

Chavez, the grandson of a Mexican immigrant farmworker spent his childhood picking grapes, melons, beans, and other staple crops at low wages for long hours. As early as 1949, Chavez was committed to eliminating the unfair and dangerous environments of some farmworkers. In 1962, Chavez united 70,000 farmworkers to form the National Farmers Workers Association, predecessor to the United Farm Workers of America. Throughout his life, Chavez lived along side his campesino brothers and sisters in humble surroundings. He died on April 23, 1993, in San Luiz, AZ, a small farming town near the Mexican border.

Cesar Chavez' struggles for equal rights and equal opportunity reached beyond labor issues for migrant workers. Chavez was one of the first to address the nationwide state of Hispanics in this country. Chavez advocated Hispanic concerns in meetings with heads of state and was strongly supported by Robert F. Kennedy and his family. In his lifetime Chavez championed environmental campaigns against pesticide and chemical abuse and worked for equal rights for millions of urban Hispanics to achieve educational, housing, and political opportunities.

It is only fitting that we as a nation establish a day to honor Cesar Chavez as a great American and as an internationally respected humanitarian renowned for his tireless advocacy on behalf of the poor and exploited. This commemorative legislation will compliment the grassroots movements to honor Cesar Chavez throughout the United States. My State of New Mexico was the first State in the Nation to pass legislation honoring Cesar Chavez. Right now hundreds of people in California are retracing the historic steps that Cesar Chavez and farmworkers took through the San Joaquin Valley of California in 1966 bringing attention to the plight of migrant farmworkers. Thousands of other supporters in Texas, Michigan, and Arizona have also organized efforts to commemorate Chavez.

I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring Cesar Chavez by cosponsoring the resolution honoring his birthday.

□ 1210

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). 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.

The first recorded vote ordered will be taken after debate has concluded on the first 3 motions to suspend the rules, but not before 5 p.m. today. Recorded votes ordered on the remaining bills considered under suspension of the rules will be taken on Tuesday, April 19.

AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF FACILITY AT HINES, IL, FOR TEMPORARY ACCOMMODATIONS FOR FAMILY MEMBERS OF SEVERELY ILL CHILDREN

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1617) to authorize the establishment on the grounds of the Edward Hines, Jr., Department of Veterans Affairs Hospital, Hines, IL, of a facility to provide temporary accommodations for family members of severely ill children being treated at a nearby university medical center.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1617

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORITY TO ENTER INTO AGREEMENT FOR USE OF PROPERTY AT EDWARD HINES, JR., DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS HOSPITAL.

(a) IN GENERAL. The Secretary of Veterans Affairs may enter into a long-term lease or similar agreement with the organization known as The Caring Place at Loyola, Inc., a not-for-profit organization operating under the laws of the State of Illinois, to permit that organization to establish on the grounds of the Edwards Hines, Jr., Department of Veterans Affairs Hospital, Hines, Illinois, a facility to provide temporary accommodations for family members of severely ill children who are being treated at the Loyola University of Chicago Medical Center and other hospitals.

(b) CONDITIONS.—An agreement under subsection (a) shall ensure that there shall be no cost to the United States as a result of the property use authorized by that subsection and may permit the use of the property without rent.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks, and include extraneous matter, on H.R. 1617 and the next veterans bill which we will consider today, H.R. 4013.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1617 would make it possible to set up a Ronald McDonald House at the VA hospital at Hines, IL.

This facility would provide a temporary place to stay for parents of severely ill children being treated at the Loyola University of Chicago Medical Center.

I want to thank the author of the bill, the gentlewoman from Illinois, Mrs. COLLINS, for introducing this worthy legislation. I am pleased to join her and all members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS].

Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to speak in support of H.R. 1617, which would authorize the Caring Place at Loyola, Inc. to use a vacant piece of property on the campus of Edward Hines, Jr., Department of Veterans Affairs Hospital for a facility to provide temporary lodging for family members of severely ill children being treated at Loyola University of Chicago Medical Center and other hospitals. The Caring Place at Loyola, Inc. is an Illinois not-for-profit corporation which has identified the need for such a facility close to Loyola University Medical Center. Because of its location, unused status, and Hines officials' willingness to make it available, the property on the grounds of the VA hospital is ideal for this project.

This undertaking will be of no expense to the Federal Government because its entire cost of $3.5 million will be raised from private funds. Interested citizens, as well as hospital administrators, doctors, and nurses at Loyola Medical Center and the surrounding communities are working diligently as we speak to raise the funds needed to build this 15-room structure.

Initially, the organizing committee for this project had hoped to accomplish a long-term lease agreement for the establishment of this facility through administrative action by the Department of Veterans Affairs, but they were advised by the Department that they needed to pursue this legislation and that is the reason for our bill today.

In his letter endorsing this project, Secretary Jesse Brown of the Department of Veterans Affairs, called it "* * * a much-needed service * * * a good example of a successful joint public-private venture that benefits the community at no out-of-pocket cost to the Government."

By establishing the Caring Place at Loyola we can help relieve the psychological and physical stress suffered by the families of children being treated for the most serious medical conditions. In many cases the physical presence and care of loved ones is as important to the healing process as the treatment plan or medicine regime that these children are receiving. To a severely ill child there is no substitute for his or her mother and father. This bill will provide a place for these families to stay nearby so that they can be with their loved ones when they are needed most.

I would like to thank Chairman MONTGOMERY, Ranking Member BOB STUMP, Subcommittee Chairman ROWLAND, and the other members of the Committee on Veterans Affairs for their positive and nonpartisan support for this project effort. Certainly, I speak for the many volunteers and the future families who will use this facility. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this simple but necessary legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1617, a bill to establish a Ronald McDonald House at the Hines VA Medical Center in Illinois.

I would like to join Chairman MONTGOMERY in applauding Congresswoman CARDISS COLLINS for introducing this important legislation and I will yield to the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care, CHRIS SMITH, for an explanation of the bill.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1617.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Hospitals and Health Care.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 1617, a bill which will authorize the establishment of a Ronald McDonald House at the VA Medical Center at Hines, IL.

Most of my colleagues are familiar with these houses as they are available at many private-sector medical centers throughout the country. Their purpose is to provide temporary housing for the parents of seriously ill children who are undergoing medical treatment. What is envisioned in H.R. 1617 is that the Secretary of Veterans Affairs would enter into a long-term lease with the caring place at Loyola, Inc., to establish and operate a Ronald McDonald House on unused grounds of the Edward Hines, Jr., VA Medical Center. The Ronald McDonald House authorized by this measure would provide housing for the families of children being treated at the Loyola University of Chicago

Medical Center which is adjacent to the Hines VA Medical Center.

This House will provide a much needed service to the community served by these medical centers at no cost to the Federal Government. The VA does not use and has no plans to use the site on which the Ronald McDonald House would be located.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objections to passage of this bill and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. COLLINS], for this excellent legislation. As the gentlewoman said, this is private, public, and veterans programs working together. That is what it is all about, to help all people in the different communities.

Also, Mr. Speaker, we have at the desk these blue sheets that explain this bill and the next bill that we will take up.

I would also like to mention of the loss of our American soldiers and others in that tragedy that happened in northern Iraq. These American soldiers could have had up to $200,000 of veterans life insurance. I hope they did. I hope they had the maximum, because certainly that would help the families to adjust and to carry on with life at this sad time.

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

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] that the House suspend the rule and pass the bill, H.R. 1617.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1220

PROVIDING FOR CONCURRENCE BY THE HOUSE WITH AMENDMENTS TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 821, EXTENDING ELIGIBILITY FOR BURIAL IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 406) providing for the concurrence by the House with amendments in amendment of the Senate to H.R. 821.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 406

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the bill (H.R. 821), to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for burial in national cemeteries to persons who have 20 years of service creditable for retired pay as members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces, with the Senate amendment thereto, shall be considered to have been taken from the Speaker's table to the end that the Senate amendment thereto be, and the same is hereby, agreed to with amendments as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the amendment of the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill, insert the following:

SECTION. 1 ELIGIBILITY OF CERTAIN RESERVISTS AND DEPENDENTS FOR BURIAL IN NATIONAL CEMETERIES.

(a) RESERVISTS.—Section 2402 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting after paragraph (6) the following new paragraph (7):

"(7) Any person who at the time of death was entitled to retired pay under that chapter but for the fact that the person was under 60 years of age."

(b) DEPENDENTS.—Paragraph (5) of such section is amended by inserting "and paragraph (7)" after "paragraphs (1) through (4)".

Amend the title so as to read: "An Act to amend title 38, United States Code, to extend eligibility for burial in national cemeteries to persons who have 20 years of service creditable for retired pay as members of a reserve component of the Armed Forces and to their dependents".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY].

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

Mr. Speaker, the compromise measure we have agreed to with the Senate would extend burial eligibility in national cemeteries to members of the National Guard and reservists who have qualified service of 20 or more years and their next of kin can ask to be buried in the national cemetery. The only difference between this measure and the bill we passed last August is that the spouse or minor child would also be made eligible for these benefits.

Several years ago, an advisory committee on military pay and benefits recommended the provision of these benefits to the Reserve Forces as a reflection of the service voluntarily rendered their country. The requirement that guardsmen and reservists be prepared to report within 24 hours of notification of a callup underscores the fact that today's selected reservists are truly members of the total force.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to commend GEORGE SANGMEISTER, chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs. As we all know, Mr. SANGMEISTER has announced his plans not to seek reelection at the end of the Congress. He has done an outstanding job of chairing the subcommittee and he will be missed. I also want to thank my friend, the very able ranking minority member of the full committee, BOB STUMP, and the ranking member of the subcommittee, DAN BURTON, for their leadership on this bill. Last, I want to acknowledge Congressman HENRY BONILLA of Texas and CHARLIE STENHOLM of Texas, for their efforts in behalf of reservists and National Guardsmen with his sponsorship of H.R. 821.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this compromise measure.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution and the compromise it represents to provide full burial benefits in national cemeteries to Nation Guard and Reserve retirees who have completed 20 years or more as members of a Reserve component of the armed services and their dependents.

I commend my colleague, HENRY BONILLA, for introducing the original bill. Together, our efforts will ensure that reserve component forces receive the Nation's full recognition as a final tribute for their service.

Mr. Speaker, I also wish to thank my good friend SONNY MONTGOMERY, chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, for his consideration of this matter.

In addition, I wish to recognize the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SANGMEISTER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing and Memorial Affairs, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the subcommittee's ranking member for their leadership on this measure.

I recommend that the resolution be passed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], the original sponsor of the bill.

Mr. BONILLA. Mr. Speaker, the price of freedom is high and never ending. From Saratoga to Normandy to Khe Sanh, America's finest have risked their lives to preserve the freedom we all cherish and all too often take for granted. During peacetime, citizen soldiers have stood watch defending our borders and shores. Their vigilance and sacrifice have deterred countless foes and saved countless lives.

Our fellow Americans serving in the National Guard and Reserves have played a fundamental role in deterring these potential aggressors. This legislation before us today offers but a small recognition of the sacrifices of these true Americans.

H.R. 821 will permit those members of the National Guard and Reserve with 20 years of service creditable to military retirement, along with their dependents, to be buried in our national cemeteries.

My colleagues, we certainly owe no less to these individuals who have been

on call for 20 years defending the freedom each and every one of us enjoys.

The important role played by modern day minutemen was evident during Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm when 228,000 Reserve and National Guard personnel were called up.

These dedicated Americans left their families at a moment's notice to serve. During floods, earthquakes, and other national disasters, these individuals remain on call to offer a helping hand to their fellow citizens in need.

H.R. 821 represents but one small means of saying your sacrifices are recognized and America thanks you.

I would like to thank Chairmen MONTGOMERY and SANGMEISTER, ranking members STUMP and BURTON, and the committee's diligent and able staff for their hard work and commitment to passing this legislation which helps America meet it's responsibilities to those who have served. I look forward to continuing to work with the committee to make sure that America never forgets its commitments to those who have served.

My colleagues, I believe our task today is simple. To honor the American virtues of loyalty, freedom, duty, and honesty please join me and vote yes to pass this bill.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would like to congratulate, again, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA] for this legislation and my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] for getting it to the floor. This will be a great help and boost to the national guardsmen and reservists who are about a third of the forces out there now defending our country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SANGMEISTER].

Mr. SANGMEISTER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 821 passed the House on August 2, 1993 and the Senate passed it with amendments on November 11, 1993. The bill before us represents the compromise between the House and the Senate on the differences.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed compromise would extend eligibility for burial in national cemeteries to members of the Reserves and National Guard who have qualified service of 20 or more years. Burial eligibility would also be extended to their dependents.

Our Nation has long depended upon and recognized the contribution of our citizen soldiers. From the Minutemen of the Revolution to the valiant men and women who served during Desert Storm, our Reserve and National Guard members must satisfy the full mobilization requirements of all active duty forces. During a 20-year career the men and women of our Reserve Forces perform more than 2 years of collective military service, an amount of time equivalent to that which currently qualifies active duty veterans for burial in a national cemetery. According the Congressional Budget Office, the costs associated with this measure are insignificant.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for the RECORD a joint explanatory statement outlining in greater detail the differences between the House and the Senate passed bills.

I would like to commend the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the chairman of the full committee for his leadership and ongoing support of this measure. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. STUMP] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the ranking minority members of the full committee and subcommittee for their efforts and support. In particular, I would like to thank HENRY BONILLA who introduced this bipartisan bill along with CHARLIE STENHOLM, TOM DELAY and Veterans' Affairs Committee members FRANK TEJEDA and STEPHEN BUYER.

Mr. Speaker, I urge favorable consideration of the House amendments to H.R. 821.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF H.R. 821

This document explains the provisions and legislative history of measures relating to eligibility for burial in national cemeteries for individuals who have served 20 years in the reserve component and for their dependents. These provisions have been passed by the Senate and House of Representatives, agreed upon by the Senate and House Committees on Veterans' Affairs, and are offered as a proposed House amendment to the Senate amendment to H.R. 821.

The measures referred to above are H.R. 821 as passed by the House on August 2, 1993 (hereinafter referred to as the "House bill"), and the text of S. 1620 as reported (without written report) as an original bill on November 4, 1993, and as passed by the Senate on November 11, 1993, as a substitute amendment to H.R. 821 (hereinafter referred to as the "Senate amendment"). The Senate amendment was derived from S. 1128, which was introduced on July 17, 1993.

The differences between the House bill and the Senate amendment are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by the compromise agreement, and minor drafting, technical, and clarifying changes.

Current law: Under current law, the only members of Reserve components of the Armed Forces who are eligible for burial in a national cemetery are those who:

1. Die under honorable conditions while hospitalized or undergoing treatment at the expense of the United States for injury or disease contracted or incurred under honorable conditions while such member is performing active duty for training, inactive duty training, or traveling to and from such duty;

2. Are disabled or die from disease or injury incurred or aggravated in line of duty during or enroute to or from active duty for training; and

3. Are disabled or die from injury (but not disease) incurred or aggravated in line of duty during or enroute to or from inactive duty training.

House bill: The House bill would grant eligibility for burial in a national cemetery to any person who at the time of death was entitled to retirement pay for service in a reserve component of the Armed Forces or would have been entitled to retirement pay but for the fact that the person was under 60 years old.

Senate amendment: The Senate amendment is substantively similar to the House bill, but adds a provision granting eligibility for burial in national cemeteries to the spouses and dependents of eligible reservists.

Compromise agreement: The compromise agreement follows the Senate amendment with some minor technical and conforming changes.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say again to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SANGMEISTER] how we will miss him, as we note how dedicated he has been to this committee.

□ 1230

Mr. STUMP. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to add once again my thanks to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SANGMEISTER] for the great job he has done. He has been a great leader. We wish him the very best in his new endeavors.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, last August when the House of Representatives first debated H. Res. 406, I was pleased to be a strong supporter. As the House now reconsiders an amended version of this legislation, I remain committed to ensuring its passage.

As a supporter of H. Res. 406, legislation that extends eligibility of national cemetery burial benefits to National Guard and reservist retirees, who have completed 20 or more years of service, I am pleased that this legislation has been amended to include burial eligibility for spouses and dependents.

I commend our distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], the original sponsor of this legislation, as well as the House and Senate Members of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, who have worked so diligently to ensure that our Nation's veterans receive the benefits that they have valiantly earned.

I believe that final passage of the amended version of H. Res. 406, is essential, as this legislation pays final tribute to National Guard and reservist retirees who have given so much to our Nation. Under current law, members of the Reserves may be buried in national cemeteries only if they are disabled or die as a result of active duty. However, final passage of House Resolution 406, will guarantee that Guard and Reserve members, as well as their spouses and dependents, receive the burial benefits that they deserve. I must add that the outlays for this legislation are minimal—the Congressional Budget Office estimates less than $400,000 a year. I believe this is a small price to pay for those who have given so much for the freedom that we in America enjoy.

As a long time supporter of veterans issues, I am pleased that the House of Representatives is discussing this important issue. The death of a loved one causes and unfortunate emotional strain. However, the death of a loved one should not cause a financial strain too. Accordingly, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 34, that will boost funeral benefits to a level previously afforded to all our wartime veterans.

Prior to 1981, a burial allowance of up to $300 was provided in all cases where a veteran died: First, of service-connected disability; second, if he was veteran of any war; third, if he was discharged for a disability incurred or aggravated in the line of duty; or fourth, if he was in receipt of, or entitled to, disability compensation.

Under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, the veterans' burial benefits were decreased significantly by limiting funeral benefits to veterans receiving pension or compensation benefits, or residing in a VA supported health facility at the time of death. That reduction mistakenly placed an economic value on a benefit given by Congress to ensure that all veterans would be buried with dignity and respect, regardless of their income or social standing at time of death. I believe this is also in direct violation of the longstanding principle held by the American Legion which calls for equal benefits for equal service.

The 1990 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act further limited burial plot allowances. The 1990 Veterans Benefits and Services Reconciliation Conference Agreement eliminates the plot allowance of $150, with the exception of veterans who are in receipt of DVA disability benefits, such as compensation or pension.

H.R. 34, restores the pre-1981 eligibility for veterans for the purposes of receiving funeral benefits, increases the amount of those benefits from $300 to $400, and increases the plot allowance from $150 to $300.

As a nation, we have a moral obligation to provide our service men and women with funeral benefits. For this reason I am pleased to support the amended version of House Resolution 406. However, I believe that we must go a step further. I urge my colleagues to support my legislation which will reinstate our veterans' funeral benefits. By doing this we will fulfill our obligation to all those who have fought and risked their lives to protect the ideals and the people of our great Nation. We should do no less, for those who have given so much to defend our freedom.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. MONTGOMERY], that the House suspend the rules and pass the resolution, House Resolution 406.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof), the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAOUL WALLENBERG BUST PLACEMENT IN THE U.S. CAPITOL

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 222) authorizing the placement of a bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 222

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Joint Committee on the Library is authorized to accept a bust of Raoul Wallenberg and to place the bust in an appropriate location in the Capitol, as determined by the Joint Committee on the Library.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE].

Mr. ROSE. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend my colleague, Mr. LANTOS, for introducing this important resolution, and I am honored to be able to manage the measure on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that, in this time when we approach the 50th anniversary of World War II, and we reflect on the tragic holocaust that took so many lives, Jewish and others, that the United States honor a man whose dedication to compassion for fellow human beings was remarkable.

I am not referring to the worthy German, Oskar Schindler—the subject of the film "Schindler's List"—but to a Swede, Raoul Wallenberg, who volunteered to enter Nazi-occupied Europe in an effort to save Jews from mass murder. In Hungary he saved an estimated 100,000 men, women and children from Hitler's gas chambers.

Wallenberg, a graduate of the University of Michigan, restored our faith in humanity when he left the safety of neutral Sweden, his homland, to risk his life on behalf of others. Sweden was neutral, but Wallenberg was not neutral. He was committed to the cause of justice and humanity.

I favor the placement of a bust honoring Wallenberg in the U.S. Capitol to join the busts of other great foreign champions of freedom—like Garibaldi and Pulaski.

As we gaze upon this likeness of Wallenberg, we can reflect on the need to support the human rights of all those throughout the world who are subjhected to tyranny.

It is my pleasure now, Mr. Speaker, to yield such time as he may consume to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California, the Honorable TOM LANTOS, who is the architect of this worthy undertaking.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], the Chair of the Committee on House Administration, for managing, supporting and making possible this legislation.

Let me also thank all my friends on the Republican side who have been so instrumental in moving this legislation.

Most of all, let me thank my wife, Annette, who has been the inspiration and the driving force behind this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, within a few weeks we will be debating on this floor another resolution that I had the privilege of submitting, the resolution commemorating the 50th anniversary of the Allied landing in Normandy, which was the pivotal point in the liberation of Europe from Nazi tyranny. Today we honor a man who—behind Nazi lines, at enormous risk to his own life—put himself between persecuted victims of the Holocaust and the mighty Nazi German war machine and saved as many as 100,000 lives.

My first act in this body, Mr. Speaker, some 13 years ago, was to introduce legislation conferring honorary citizenship on Raoul Wallenberg, the Swedish hero of the Holocaust, and I want to thank you for being so instrumental in the passage of that legislation.

Today we are considering a resolution that would authorize the placing of a bust of Wallenberg in this Capitol, along with busts of a number of other heroes whom we have honored, from Kosciusko and Kossuth to Garibaldi and Winston Churchill.

Raoul Wallenberg, against overwhelming odds, placed himself in a situation of ultimate danger, but through his heroism and sacrifice, 100,000 human beings were allowed to survive the Second World War.

It is so appropriate that we do this today, when apparently—not having learned the lesson that we cannot yield to aggression—some 200,000 innocent human lives have been lost in Bosnia, and over 1 million innocent people are refugees in 1994, 50 years after the conclusion of the Second World War.

The Normandy landings and the heroism of Raoul Wallenberg a half century ago taught us that we cannot yield to tyranny. We must stand up to oppression and brutality, and we must be willing to take risks to save human lives.

Raoul Wallenberg, who paid for his heroism with decades of nightmarish existence in the Soviet gulag, is the ultimate inspiration to all of us, teaching us that we are all our brother's and sister's keeper; that we cannot look away at moments of the most danger, but we must have the courage and the determination and the will to resist tyranny.

When Raoul Wallenberg's statue is unveiled in this Capitol, we will pay tribute not just to this great humanitarian, this great son of Sweden, but we will pay tribute to all men and women who recognize that there are issues beyond themselves, there are causes that transcend their lives, for which they are prepared to sacrifice their own.

I want to thank all of my colleagues for their support.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I, like the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE], want

to commend the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for bringing this matter to the attention of this body.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when many lives have been lost throughout the world due to crime and military conflicts, it is encouraging to go back in history and remember the plight of a real life hero who ended up saving 100,000 innocent men, women, and children.

Many people from Europe will proudly tell you the story of Raoul Wallenberg. However, Mr. Wallenberg's legacy is not limited to Sweden or Eastern Europe. You can go to so many towns and cities in my district, and elsewhere across this country, and the many people of Swedish descent will tell you the story of this remarkable individual.

Raoul Wallenberg was a son of one of Sweden's most distinguished families and a graduate architect of the University of Michigan. During World War II, at the request of the United States, Raoul Wallenberg volunteered to conduct a dangerously complex rescue mission in the heart of the Hungarian Holocaust.

He armed himself with documents he printed as Swedish protective passports, that he would later provide Jewish victims who were condemned to death. Wallenberg also set up safe havens in large apartment houses in Budapest.

After retrieving these victims from certain death, he would put them in the shelters he had created. There, his underground messengers could provide food and medicine to the rescued individuals.

Mr. Speaker, we have the opportunity to commemorate this heroic man and his incredible feat. This gentleman was the second person in the history of the United States, behind Winston Churchill, to be awarded honorary American citizenship by the U.S. Congress.

House Concurrent Resolution 222 will authorize the placement of a bust of Mr. Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

□ 1240

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LEWIS]

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 222, authorizing the placement of a bust of Raoul Wallenberg in this Capitol Building. I also want to commend my good friend and colleague TOM LANTOS for introducing this resolution and for his tireless efforts on behalf of Raoul Wallenberg.

Raoul Wallenberg was a Swedish diplomat who literally put his life on the line to save the lives of tens of thousands of Hungarian Jews during the dark dark days of World War II. Wallenberg issued thousands of Swedish protective passports to Jews in Hungary, set up international safe houses where refugees were kept alive with food and medical treatment, and repeatedly put himself in harm's way to literally pull people from the death trains headed for the Nazi extermination camps.

Raoul Wallenberg was a man of uncommon courage and incomparable spirit. His story is a testament of the good that one man can do, a legacy of heroism in the face of ultimate adversity, or righteousness in an era of insanity. He is a hero whose deeds serve as an inspiration for all mankind. It is only appropriate that Rauol Wallenberg's bust stand in the U.S. Capitol alongside other great champions of freedom and human liberty like Taddeaus Kosciusko, Casimir Pulaski, and Rev. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, the fate that ultimately befell Raoul Wallenberg after his arrest by Russian troops in Hungary in 1945 is still not known. We hope and pray, Mr. Speaker, that one day soon that mystery will be solved.

Mr. Speaker, today let Raoul Wallenberg's bust stand in our U.S. Capitol as an inspiration to us all, as a testament to the triumph of good over evil, as a tribute to the notion that one man or woman can make a difference.

Support House Concurrent Resolution 222.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. HORN].

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BARRETT] for yielding me this time, and I commend my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], for bringing this matter before Congress.

Mr. Speaker, as we look around this Chamber, we see above the galley of 24 medallions of the great lawgivers of history. As we look on our side of the Chamber, we see a portrait of one of the first foreigners to be imbued with the spirit of liberty and freedom and with compassion for humanity, the Marquis de Lafayette, a French nobleman who came over here in his twenties to become a major general in Washington's army and to help a band of revolutionaries gain their freedom from the tyranny of that day.

Mr. Speaker, a few decades ago, we honored a British statesman and Prime Minister who was one of the great men of the 20th century, Winston Churchill, who came back to the land of his mother to be honored by Congress as one of the leaders of the free world. Churchill was the lone leader, who in the 1930's protested the growing tyranny—and the butchery to be—of Adolf Hitler.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor Raoul Wallenberg, son of a distinguished Swedish family; a diplomat himself who carried on the spirit of freedom and the spirit of compassion for humanity by his actions in wartime Hungary.

Mr. Speaker, at that time in the 1940's Hungary was dominated by the puppets of Adolf Hitler, one of the horrible tyrants of the modern age. In his early thirties, Wallenberg defied that tyranny, took great risks, and overcame great odds in his dedicated quest to preserve human life, liberty, and freedom for 100,000 Jews. His bust in this Capitol will stand as a beacon of freedom and compassion for people who are oppressed all over the world. Today, he joins Lafayette and Churchill.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to participate in this ceremony. In conclusion, I say to our new friends in Russia who have democracy in their eyes and hopefully in their hearts that someday we must get at the truth as to what happened to Raoul Wallenberg when one of the other principal butchers of this century, Joseph Stalin, had Wallenberg in his hands. What happened to this great humanitarian remains to be told. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that our new friends in Russia will help reveal that untold story before the end of this century. Men and women who believe in freedom need to know.

Mr. SWETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 222, which authorizes the placement of a bust honoring Raoul Wallenberg in the U.S. Capitol. I would like to commend two of our distinguished colleagues for their leadership on the matter before the House today.

First, Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, Chairman ROSE of the Committee on House Administration, for his support of this legislation and his leadership in bringing this measure to the floor of the House today.

Second, I commend the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS] for his consistent efforts in Congress to honor Raoul Wallenberg and to seek the freedom of Wallenberg from Soviet prisons. As the Members of this body know, Mr. LANTOS is more than a colleague to me—we share considerably more. His daughter is my wife; my children are his grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, the direct efforts of Raoul Wallenberg in saving the lives of tens of thousands of Hungarian Jews and the motivation to numerous others which his example inspired have very directly touched my life. Tom and Annette Lantos were saved through those efforts—without that effort, my wife Katrina, never would have been born.

Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that we honor Raoul Wallenberg by placing a bust in our Nation's Capitol. Wallenberg's life-saving activities in Budapest were undertaken at the request of and with significant financial support from the United States War Refugee Board. By 1944 the unmitigated horror of the mass slaughter of innocent women, children,

and men by Nazi officials was so blatant and well-known, that Americans could not continue to deny the Holocaust. When Nazi military forces occupied Hungary and Adolf Eichmann arrived in Budapest personally to supervise the massacre of Hungarian Jews, our Government could no longer look the other way. Raoul Wallenberg undertook a mission to save the lives of those destined for the gas chambers of Auschwitz at the request of representatives of our Government.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, Raoul Wallenberg is the second person following Sir Winston Churchill to be granted honorary American citizenship. It is appropriate that, as we honor Churchill with a bust in our Nation's Capitol, we also so honor Wallenberg.

The time when the Congress takes this fitting action, Mr. Speaker, is also most appropriate. Just a few weeks ago we marked the 50th anniversary of the Nazi German occupation of Hungary and the beginning of the Holocaust in Hungary, as well as the arrival in Budapest of Raoul Wallenberg on his mission of mercy.

It is appropriate that just 2 weeks ago in the rotunda of our Nation's Capitol, just a few steps from this Chamber, the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Council conducted the annual National Civic Commemoration to remember the victims of the Holocaust in connection with the annual Days of Remembrance. This year the commemoration was dedicated to the Hungarian Jewish community which was decimated in the Holocaust—when Nazi military forces occupied Hungary in March 1944 there were 750,000 Jews in Hungary but 10 months later in January 1945 when the Soviet Army liberated Budapest, there were only 139,000 remaining. Without Wallenberg's mission of mercy tens of thousands more would have been wiped out.

If my wife and six children had lived in Hungary in 1944, they would have been declared racially unfit to live. They could well have been among those forced into cattle cars by Nazi soldiers or Hungarian Arrow Cross troops and sent to Auschwitz, as TOM LANTOS' mother was. Or they might have been lined up on the banks of the Danube River, and shot in the back and pushed into the river, as Annette Lantos' father was.

In the face of this brutality and horror, the actions of Raoul Wallenberg stand in stark contrast. It is one of the horrible ironies of history that after saving the lives of tens of thousands, Wallenberg's own life was snatched away from him by the Soviet Union. On January 17, 1945, he was taken into custody by Soviet military authorities in Eastern Hungary. He was subsequently imprisoned in the Soviet gulag. Although Soviet authorities claimed that he died of natural causes in a Soviet prison in 1947, there were a number of reliable sightings of him within the Soviet prison system as late as the late 1970's and possibly into the early 1980's.

It is truly tragic that this man who personally did so much to save the lives of other languished for decades in Soviet prisons. Despite the changes that have transformed the Soviet Union over the past few years, we still have not received staisfactory information regarding his whereabouts since 1945 and an accounting of his life in the Soviet prison network.

Mr. Speaker, it is most appropriate that the American people, acting through their representatives in Congress by this resolution today, honor this genuine hero who did so much to serve and save others, but who suffered such a tragic fate. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the brief description about the activities of Raoul Wallenberg taken from the program of the National Civic Ceremony of the Days of Remembrance be included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

RAOUL WALLENBERG

Early in January 1944, Secretary of the Treasury, Henry Morgenthau, successfully persuaded President Franklin Roosevelt to actively involve the United States in rescue attempts in Europe. Later that month Roosevelt established the War Refugee Board (WRB); its staff began immediately to seek help from the international community for rescue efforts. Only Sweden responded.

On the recommendation of the Swedish branch of the World Jewish Congress and with the support of the WRB, the Foreign Ministry in Stockholm sent Raoul Wallenberg to Hungary as the Third Secretary to their Legation. Wallenberg was a Swedish aristocrat, the heir of a prominent banking family who has received architectural training at the University of Michigan. He arrived in Budapest on 9 July 1944, as the massive deportations of Hungarian Jews to Auschwitz-Birkenau were ending. However, keenly aware of the continuing precarious position of Budapest Jews, Wallenberg quickly formed a special section within the embassy to aid these Jews, personally designing the famous "letters of protection" (Schutz-pass) that would save many Jewish lives when deportations resumed on 8 November.

During the fall and winter of 1944, Wallenberg's feats were not only courageous but effective. He organized "safe houses" where Jews holding Swedish letters of protection cold find refuge and comparative safety from arrest and murder by Arrow Cross thugs linked to the Hungarian fascist government, which came into power in October. Disregarding threats to his own person, he placed himself between Jews and Arrow Cross squads. During the siege of Budapest, he arranged to feed the Jews in the ghetto and his protected houses. He intervened to prevent the destruction of the Ghetto in January shortly before the liberation. To aid those condemned to the forced marches and deportation, he and his staff often appeared suddenly, offering food and medical care, or demanding that Jews possessing Swedish protective passes be returned to Budapest.

As a result of the rescue work of Raoul Wallenberg and the Swiss diplomat Charles Lutz, more than twenty-five thousand Jewish lives were saved.

After the liberation by the Red Army of the eastern sector of Budapest on 17 January 1945, Wallenberg was taken into custody by the Soviets. He is alleged to have died in their hands in 1946, but his fate is still unknown.

Mrs. KENNELLY. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 222, which would authorize a bust of Raoul Wallenberg to be placed in the Capitol.

This is a most appropriate way to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the Hungarian Holocaust and the heroic efforts of Raoul Wallenberg who helped save 100,000 lives during 1944–45. Raoul Wallenberg has already been honored by Congress by being awarded honorary American citizenship—the second man in history so honored—and this bust further commemorates his heroic efforts and lends support to the fact that one person, or a small number of people, can make a significant difference.

The facts surrounding this mission by Raoul Wallenberg are well documented. This was a man who volunteered at the request of the U.S. Government to go to Nazi-occupied Hungary to organize a network to save lives. Using Swedish passports and safe houses in Hungary, he developed a network that saved thousands and thousands of lives—people who otherwise would have been sent to the gas chambers of Nazi Germany.

After World War II, Raoul Wallenberg was arrested by the Soviet Army when they occupied Budapest, and after years of denial it was finally revealed that he had been taken to Lubyanka prison. What happened to him there remains in doubt, but no doubt exists about his heroism, his sacrifice, his unselfish devotion to the cause of humanity, and to the tens of thousands of people who owe their lives to his devotion to duty. These people, their children and their grandchildren, are a living legacy to the world. This bust will commemorate that legacy to every school class, every guided tour group, and every individual who walks by.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the full House Administration Committee chairman, CHARLIE ROSE, for introducing this resolution, Representative TOM LANTOS for working so hard to make this a reality, and Libraries and Memorials Chairman BILL CLAY for moving this resolution expeditiously for our consideration.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise in the strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 222, legislation that authorizes the Joint Committee on the Library to accept a bust of Raoul Wallenberg, and to place the bust in an appropriate location in the Capitol Complex.

I can thing of a no more fitting manner in which to honor and commemorate the life and contributions of Raoul Wallenberg, a truly righteous individual.

I praise the distinguished chairman of the Committee on House Administration, the gentleman from North Carolina, [Mr. ROSE] for introducing this important concurrent resolution. And, I commend my colleague from California [Mr. LANTOS] for his tireless commitment to promoting freedom and justice throughout the World.

As we remember the life and remarkable accomplishments of Swedish diplomat, Raoul Wallenberg, we are reminded of the goodness and kindness that human beings are capable of achieving. His life represents a triumph of good over evil and glorifies freedom and humanity.

At a time of the world's instability and chaos, Raoul Wallenberg provided strength, hope, and compassion to a people in need. Armed with Swedish diplomatic protective passports, Raoul Wallenberg saved the lives of over 100,000 Jews during World War II. He also organized the distribution of food, clothing, and medicine to those in need. Even when his own life was in danger, Raoul

Wallenberg pressed on; performing daily, what many thought could never be done.

It is because of the courage of people like Raoul Wallenberg that 50 years later, the world remembers the 6 million Jews who lost their lives during the Holocaust.

Many remember by visiting the U.S. Holocaust Memorial Museum here in Washington, DC. The museum, which is visited by hundreds daily, chronicles the horrors and the atrocities that were systemically committed just 50 years ago. For years to come, the museum will continue to serve, not only as a memorial, but also as an educational tool—reminding us of man's greatest transgression.

Others are able to remember by viewing academy award winner, Steven Spielberg's cinematic production of "Schindler's List, which tells the true story of Oskar Schindler, an unlikely hero who is credited with saving the lives of thousands of Polish Jews. Oskar Schindler's achievements, like those of Raoul Wallenberg, serve as a testimony, demonstrating the greatness that individuals are capable of.

I am hopeful that in the near future visitors to our Nation's Capitol will also be reminded by the placement of Raoul Wallenberg's bust in the U.S. Capitol. It reminds us of the righteous individual who gave the precious gift of life to many. Although his fate is still unknown, the legacy of Raoul Wallenberg and his spirit continue to live on.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join my colleagues on Monday, April 18, in voting unanimously for House Concurrent Resolution 222, providing for the placement of the Raoul Wallenberg bust in the U.S. Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, we heard stirring stories from a number of Members on Monday about how Raoul Wallenberg risked his own life in order to save the lives of tens of thousands of Hungarian Jews from Nazi German clutches during World War II. Since that time, Mr. Wallenberg's heroism has been an inspiration for generations of freedom-loving people. I am glad that Raoul Wallenberg will be properly honored by the placement of his bust in our Nation's Capitol.

Today, I would like to recognize the person who donated this bust to the people of the United States: Lillian Hoffman of Denver, CO. A Colorado native herself, Lillian's father immigrated from Russia in 1903. Lillian chairs the Colorado Committee of Concern for Soviet Jewry, a group in Denver which has played a vital role in the emigration of numerous Soviet and Russian "refuseniks"—Jews who have been denied exit visas due to spurious reasons. Active in this movement for 25 years, she has spent over 20 years working on the Wallenberg case as well. I have known Lillian, and her late husband Harry, for many of these years and have helped the committee on many refusenik cases during my tenure in Congress. Though the Soviet and Russian bureaucracy has denied exit visas to many refuseniks on whose behalf we have worked, we have been able to celebrate a number of successes as well.

Lillian's generosity to the people of the United States is vividly demonstrated in her gift of the Raoul Wallenberg bust, sculpted by Miri Margolin of Israel. I salute Lillian's compassion and her ongoing work at the Colorado Committee of Concern for Soviet Jewry. Jews still waiting for exit visas in the countries of the former Soviet Union should know that they are not forgotten so long as Lillian Hoffman and her committee are active. Thank you Lillian for your compassion and generosity.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MAZZOLI). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. ROSE] that the House suspend the rules, and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 222.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 222, the resolution just considered.

The Speaker pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. GARY A. CONDIT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore, laid before the House the following communication from Hon. GARY A. CONDIT, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 6, 1994.

Hon. THOMAS S. FOLEY,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives, the Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that my office has been served with a subpoena for records of a member of my staff issued by the Stanislaus County Superior Court in Modesto, California in connection with a civil case.

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

Sincerely,

GARY A. CONDIT,
Member of Congress.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 4:30 p.m.

□ 1644

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAYES) at 4 o'clock and 44 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2333, STATE DEPARTMENT, USIA, AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2333) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State, the U.S. Information Agency, and related agencies, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. GILMAN

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. GILMAN moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2333 be instructed to insist upon the provision contained in section 132(f) of the House bill relating to the continuation of the Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism at the Department of State.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

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

My motion to instruct is very simple. It is my intent to have the conferees instructed to insist on language in the House bill that requires the State Department to retain the independent Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism.

The language prevents the implementation of a proposed State Department reorganization plan that would downgrade the Office of Coordinator for Counterterrorism to the level of a Deputy Assistance Secretary of State.

The Senate's language will permit this reorganization and thus the elimination of this important office.

My bipartisan amendment to H.R. 2333, agreed to by the House last June, creates a permanent statutory office maintaining this counterterrorism function at the highly visible equivalency level of Assistant Secretary of State.

I was especially pleased that my good friend and colleague from New York, Mr. NADLER, who represents lower Manhattan, where the Trade Center terrorist bombing occurred, joined in supporting the amendment that passed the House last June.

Under the proposed reorganization plan, the current Office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism will be eliminated unless we act.

Unless this language is retained by the conference, the counterterrorism function will be delegated down to that of a midlevel Deputy Assistant Secretary. It will be part of a new multiple function office whose responsibilities also will include narcotics and international crime.

The international narcotics function alone, as we know, could easily consume the entire time, focus and attention of the Assistant Secretary of the proposed new multifunction bureau.

Since early last year, the United States has seen an increased level of international terrorism directed at American political leaders, citizens, their property, and their very safety.

For example, the New York World Trade Center bombing took the lives of 6 Americans, including a constituent of mine, injured 1,000 people and cost over $600 million in property damage and business disruption.

We have seen reports of the terrorist plot against commuter tunnels, other Government facilities, and political leaders in New York.

Given these incidents here in the United States, the rise of new, loosely knit terrorist groups, and other forces promoting terrorism around the globe, this is not the time for America to lower its guard against the horrors and threats of international terrorism.

We must make international terrorism a national priority in our foreign policy plans, and structure as well.

The State Department proposal to diminish the counterterrorism function sends the wrong signal at the wrong time, both to our friends and foes alike, the world over.

Former career Ambassador at Large for Counterterrorism Paul Bremer, an expert in this area, said it best when he told Congress:

> * * * I am disappointed, indeed, dismayed by the administration's decision to downgrade the bureaucratic level of the State Department's office for combatting terrorism.

Further, he said, and I quote:

> This will not only make interagency coordination more difficult and problematic in our Government, but will make us much less effective when we go to our allies or to State sponsors and ask them for help. In my experience, other governments are not often persuaded by importuning deputy assistant secretaries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this motion to instruct our House conferees. The Nation and the victims of the Trade Center bombing would expect nothing less from their elected representatives here in the Congress than the maintenance of this critical office in the battle against international terrorism.

Let us today go firmly on the record in favor of continuing the high priority the United States places on combating international terrorism.

□ 1650

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say to the gentleman from New York that it is not my intention to oppose his motion. I want to commend him for the work that he has done in the whole field of counterterrorism. He has made that quite a specialty, and he has made constructive suggestions to our policy on counterterrorism over a period of several years.

I think he knows the Department of State does oppose his amendment, so what I will say to him this evening is simply that we will not oppose his motion to instruct. He understands the administration opposes the content of his motion to instruct, and I will try to work with him and the administration and the Department of State in the conference to work out an acceptable solution for both parties.

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

Mr. HAMILTON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments, our distinguished chairman.

I certainly look forward to working with him in the conference to see if we can arrive at a practical solution to this problem.

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], indicated, I do not rise to oppose this amendment and will not seek a rollcall vote on this amendment.

I think it is fair though to elaborate on this administration's feelings about how this office should be organized.

The gentleman from Indiana, the chairman of the full committee, made reference to the work that the gentleman from New York, the sponsor of this motion, had done in the area of counterterrorism. I am happy to have worked with him on a number of these causes. I would be terribly concerned if I thought that this administration, through its organizational changes, was in any way eroding its commitment to do what it can at diplomatic levels, at technological levels, and at all levels against terrorism. I would join him enthusiastically in a second.

I do not think that is the case. The administration's plan is designed to revitalize the counterterrorism office to make it more active, to make it less reactive. The coordinator for counterterrorism will be an Assistant Secretary of State, not a Deputy Assistant Secretary. He will be in the mainstream chain of command within the State Department, not an adjunct office lost in a big bureaucracy.

The coordinator will be the official in the Department responsible for counterterrorism.

Under the amendment of the junior Senator from New York, which is in the Senate's version of this bill and which the administration does not oppose, the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Counterterrorism, who will have a day-to-day responsibility for counterterrorism, would have the rank of ambassador subject to Senate confirmation. The new bureau will combine all of the State Department's counterrorism capabilities into a single bureau. In a crisis or emergency, there will be wider resources to draw upon to support counterterrorism efforts.

That, by the way, Assistant Secretary, the person who will take over the responsibility for coordinator, who will have a Deputy Assistant Secretary whose full responsibility will be in counterrorism, will be reporting to the Under Secretary that is being created by the administration's reorganization, our former colleague from Colorado, Mr. Wirth, who under the processes now existing in the State Department on a regular basis meets with the Secretary, avoiding the problem that we saw too many times in the past where the issue of counterterrorism is shunted off to the side, and the inputs from that office do not come into play in the geographic bureaus and, therefore, are not given sufficient credence in policy determinations.

Counterterrorism under the reorganization plan of the administration will remain a separate function within the reorganized Bureau of Narcotics, Terrorism, and Crime. It will not be folded into counternarcotics operations. However, given the close ties between drug trafficking and terrorism around the world, it makes sense to bring the resources of the Department on these important issues into one bureau.

Moreover, the new bureau will mirror the organization of some of our key allies who are focusing on terrorism, nar-

cotics, and crime. Furthermore, Ambassador Robert Gelbard, who was recently confirmed to be Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics Matters, would become, under the reorganization plan, the Assistant Secretary for Narcotics, Terrorism, and Crime and the coordinator for counterterrorism. Ambassador Gelbard has both a professional and a personal interest in counterterrorism, professionally as a distinguished career diplomat with 27 years in the Foreign Service, and long experience in counterterrorism and narcotics issues. He is an expert in this field. He will bring enormous experience and energy to combating terrorism around the world.

It has been alleged and asserted by our former Ambassador at Large for Counterterrorism, Paul Bremer, that the administration has somehow by this reorganization gutted the current Office of Counterterrorism by cutting 40 percent of the staff. This claim is simply not true.

According to the State Department, the number of personnel in the Office of Counterterrorism at the working level is the same as it always has been and will remain that way under the reorganization plan.

Mr. Speaker, I think in the end the best argument I can make as to why we should not build too much hopes on how we particularly decide to reorganize this office within the executive branch is to recall that at the time when the Assistant Secretary ambassadorial rank Office of Counterterrorism existed in earlier years during the 1980's, there was a complete failure of that bureau to be able to impact on the policies of the geographic bureau, so you saw, for instance, the Bureau of Near East Affairs, and the gentleman from New York pointed out this problem many times during that time, the Bureau of Near East Affairs, notwithstanding Iraq and Saddam Hussein's continuous support for terrorism, having tremendous influence on the Secretary of State and on the whole executive branch in urging that Iraq be taken off the list of countries supporting terrorism, and resisting all efforts to put Iraq back on that list and not effectively denying Iraq the kind of materials and exports that a country on the terrorism list would otherwise have been eligible for even though we had a freestanding office headed by an Assistant Secretary, a distinguished ambassador; he could not infiltrate, he could not make his voice heard. He knew. He briefed us on the problems in Iraq, but he could not get his own Bureau of Near East Affairs to do anything about it.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Just on that point with regard to Iraq being allowed to be taken off the terrorist list, I have been informed that removal was in 1982 before the office was created in 1985. So it was before there was an independent office.

Mr. BERMAN. The gentleman is correct. Iraq was taken off the list of countries supporting terrorism in 1982. The gentleman may remember the bill he cosponsored that I introduced to place Iraq back on the list of countries supporting terrorism. The gentleman, I know, had many of the same briefings I had from that terrorism office in 1985 and afterwards about the work of Abu Nidal, who had been based in Baghdad, about the fact that the *Achille Lauro* hijacking, that the individual who perpetrated that terrorism act was given safe haven in Baghdad, about the support of Ibu Abrahim, the suitcase bomber in Baghdad during that time. That terrorism office was telling us these problems with Iraq, and notwithstanding that, the Secretary of State and the administration were opposing our mutual efforts to put Iraq back on the list of countries supporting terrorism.

□ 1700

My point is it does not matter how you organize it; it is how much weight you give to it and how you organize so that policies that focus on counterterrorism can permeate the Department.

I would suggest that the structure that this administration has proposed, which would have the Undersecretary who meets with the Secretary on a daily basis, on a regular basis, bringing the concerns of the terrorism unit to the Secretary of State, can have more impact in the fight on terrorism than we did the old way, where you had a freestanding official who was floating around without the kind of access that allowed him to do that.

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

Mr. BERMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, is it not true that under the existing structure, the Office of Counterterrorism is a separate entity; is that not true?

Mr. BERMAN. It is.

Mr. GILMAN. It is not folded into any other organization. And the present person who coordinates that office is known as a coordinator with Assistant Secretary responsibilities.

Mr. BERMAN. That is right.

Mr. GILMAN. And what we are doing now under the reorganization plan is taking that coordinator in a separate office with ambassadorial title and Assistant Secretary status and folding him in with an office where we have crime responsibilities and narcotics responsibilities; is that accurate?

Mr. BERMAN. It is correct. The coordinator for counterterrorism will also have responsibilities, overall responsibilities, for narcotics and for crime.

Mr. GILMAN. That is why I am concerned that this is hardly the time to essentially downgrade our Government's attention to terrorism. There is no efficiency and no symbiosis to be gained for either policy by lumping these two disparate functions together.

And finally, the administration's proposal, I think, is a blueprint for bureaucratic incompetence. The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Counterterrorism will not have the bureaucratic muscle to pursue aggressive counterterrorism policies, at home or abroad. And so it will not be able to get its work done.

Since 1986, the agency, in developing and implementing our Government's counterterrorism policy, has been a separate entity. This it can do only when the Department's Office on Counterterrorism has sufficient bureaucratic clout within the Department of State and with other agencies.

It is for that reason that I have this letter before me signed by Ambassador Paul Bremer III, former Ambassador-at-Large for Counterterrorism; Peter C.W. Flory, former Associate Coordinator for Counterterrorism in the State Department; John P. Walters, former Deputy Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy; and William J. Olson, former Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Narcotics Matters, Department of State—all saying that their concern is not partisan. In fact, the reorganization plan, they state, was first prepared in the previous administration; rather, they are united in their professional concern that the Department of State not make a mistake certain to be costly to American security and Americans lives in the years to come.

DON'T GUT OUR COUNTER-TERRORISM CAPABILITY

DEAR SENATOR: As the Senate prepares to debate the State Department authorization bill (S. 1281), we respectfully urge you to support the House position retaining a strong U.S. counter-terrorism capability. The House bill would maintain an independent office of the Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism (S/CT), and underline the importance our country continues to place on fighting the scourge of terrorism.

Today the State Department is implementing a reorganization plan that would downgrade the Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism from an independent Assistant Secretary-level position to one among several Deputy Assistant Secretaries, under a new Assistant Secretary responsible for narcotics and international crime as well as terrorism.

This plan is deeply flawed.

1. This is hardly the time to downgrade our government's attention to terrorism.

The Administration's plan seems to assume that terrorism is no longer a serious threat. It is. Just in the past year, terrorism has arrived at America's shores in the World Trade Center bombing and the subsequent plots to assassinate a U.S. Senator and bomb other targets in New York City. President Saddam Hussein planned to assassinate former President Bush. Meanwhile, radical Shiite terrorism sponsored by Iran continues

and is ominously joined by growing Sunni terror. Ethnic conflicts are expanding across the world, spawning more terror from which the U.S. will not be immune. Hijackings, which had been brought largely under control, have staged a dramatic return in Russia and China.

2. There is no efficiency and no symbiosis to be gained for either policy by lumping these two disparate functions together.

The plan's concept of linking counter-terrorism to counter-narcotics is superficial and flawed. While much has been written about the overlap of terrorism and narcotics trafficking, in fact these connections are limited and unimportant. True, some Latin American narcotics traffickers have used terrorism. Some terrorists, like Peru's Shining Path, have sold drugs. But the overwhelming majority of terrorist attacks against American targets has always been and remains rooted in political issues. Lumping these two unrelated functions together as proposed will eviscerate our counter-terrorism policy and needlessly undermine our counter-narcotics efforts. Proposing to friendly governments joint meetings of counter-terrorism and counter-narcotics agencies, as the Administration has done, will only confuse both the issues and our foreign interlocutors.

3. Finally, the Administration's proposal is a blueprint for bureaucratic impotence. The Deputy Assistant Secretary for Counter-Terrorism will not have the bureaucratic muscle to pursue aggressive counter-terrorism policies, at home or abroad. And so it will not get done.

The measures required to fight terrorism are never popular with vested interests, whether in the American or other countries' bureaucracies. It can only be done well with a relentless, high-level push, at home and overseas. Since 1986, the State Department has served as the lead agency in developing and implementing our government's counter-terrorism policies. This it could do only when the Department's Office of Counter-Terrorism had sufficient bureaucratic clout, within the State Department, with other agencies in Washington, and abroad. Until now, the head of the State Department Counter-Terrorism office reported directly to the Secretary of State and had the appropriate rank to insist on seeing responsible foreign government officials.

Instead, the Administration proposes to bury the job in a new bureau, lowering its level to Deputy Assistant Secretary. The incumbent will report to the new Assistant Secretary, who will report to an Undersecretary—whose other global responsibilities include international population control, environmental matters, refugees, human rights, democratization, labor, oceans policy, and crime—who in turn will report to the Secretary of State. This long, cumbersome chain will fool no one, not least terrorists and foreign governments. It can only undermine our ability to pursue an effective counter-terrorism policy, and signal that the United States has decided terrorism is no longer a priority issue.

This mistake has been made before, for it was into precisely this bureaucratic morass that America's counter-terrorism policy had fallen in the early 1980s. Recognizing the need for better high-level coordination of counter-terrorism policy, in 1985 the President directed the State Department to upgrade the terrorism position to Ambassador-at-Large, with direct access to the Secretary of State. It worked. The policy was taken seriously by other agencies and governments.

Some have suggested resolving this bureaucratic flaw by designating the Assistant Secretary "Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism." But fighting terrorism and fighting narcotics is each a full time job. The new Assistant Secretary will necessarily devote most of the time to the demanding day-to-day budgetary, administrative, inter-agency, diplomatic and Congressional demands of the counter-narcotics portfolio. So the reality is that the Deputy Assistant Secretary will be the most senior person with time to focus on terrorism. Denying this person the title "Coordinator" will only compound the mistake of downgrading the job.

The solution to this deeply flawed plan is to leave things as they were a year ago, which is the specific intent of the House version of the State authorization bill.

Our concern is not partisan. In fact, the reorganization plan was first prepared in the previous administration. Rather we are united in a professional concern that the Department of State not make a mistake certain to be costly to American security and American lives, in the years to come.

Sincerely,

AMBASSADOR L. PAUL BREMER, III,
Former Ambassador-at-Large for Counter-Terrorism, Department of State.

PETER C.W. FLORY,
Former Associate Coordinator for Counter-Terrorism, Department of State.

JOHN P. WALTERS,
Former Deputy Director, Office of National Drug Control Policy.

WILLIAM J. OLSON,
Former Deputy Assistant, Secretary for Int'l Narcotics Matters, Department of State.

Mr. BERMAN. If I may reclaim my time, I want to make it very clear that I do not think that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] is motivated by partisan concerns; I know that he passionately believes in an effective counterterrorism operation and that he also believes his suggested way of achieving it makes the most sense organizationally.

The only thing sillier for me to do than to get worked up on a motion that I do not intend to vote against is to keep the body here much longer getting worked up about a motion that I do not intend to oppose or vote against.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SOLOMON], the distinguished ranking member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. SOLOMON. I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, you know, as the World Trade Center bombing last year so clearly displayed, terrorism remains a major threat to America and to her citizens. That is why I joined last year with our colleagues, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER], a Democrat, and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI], a Republican, in offering an amendment to H.R. 2333, which would have preserved the Office of the Coordinator of Counterterrorism at the State Department.

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

Mr. SOLOMON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BERMAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, at the time of the World Trade Center bombing, we had an assistant secretary solely responsible, and the head of, the Office of Counterterrorism.

Mr. SOLOMON. The gentleman is absolutely right.

Let me just say that this Office has been in the forefront of our fight against this menace, and it must be preserved at all costs. The cost is not that great; as a matter of fact, it is a minus.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely no reason to believe that the terrorist threat is so diminished that we can afford to do away with that Office. Without question, without question, this is precisely the wrong time to send a signal to the world that we are downgrading our counterterrorist effort.

The language of the Senate in this bill would do just that. I therefore urge support of the Gilman motion to instruct conferees to maintain this vital Office that will save the Federal Government money. It will actually save the Federal Government money in the long run; but more importantly, Mr. Speaker, it will save American lives.

I do not know how many Members have taken the time to be briefed by the various intelligence agencies, whether it is the CIA or the Defense Intelligence Agency, or any of the agencies about the potential threat which is there. You know, you hate to even mention this on the floor for public consumption, but one simple little act in the water supply of a metropolis like the city of New York, with 8 million people, could kill 2 million people in a matter of minutes. Yet here we are going to deemphasize this terribly, terribly important Office. I do not like to play politics either, but the same thing came up this year when we talked about trying to preserve the drug czar's office and to zero in on the deadly drugs being brought into this country and being sold in schools right next door in Baltimore, where we have one individual bringing in a ton of cocaine and then using fifth graders to distribute it for them.

The Drug Czar's Office, in order to cut back like we did on our own staffs here, they laid of three-fourths of the Drug Czar's Office and hardly anybody else. Now that whole issue is being deemphasized.

I say to my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN], I know he is sincere and not politically motivated in any way, but I am afraid that is what is going to happen to this office. We cannot afford to let that happen.

So, please vote for the motion to instruct.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his poignant remarks.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. SAXTON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed the colloquy taking place here between Mr. BERMAN, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. SOLOMON. I guess all of us have to decide for ourselves whether the language in the Senate bill represents a downgrading of the effort carried out by the Office of Counterterrorism.

It appears to me, and the people who have been advising me, that it does constitute at least a potential downgrading of the Office of Counterterrorism, and I think everybody who has participated in the discussion and debate here to date this afternoon has agreed on that point. If it is a downgrading, certainly the State Department proposal would reduce the Office of Counterterrorism, which now focuses strictly on terrorism, to a lower level, Deputy Assistant Secretary, who would be responsible for 3 areas, as was pointed out by the gentlemen from New York, Mr. SOLOMON and Mr. GILMAN, and of course they are crime, narcotics, and terrorism.

□ 1710

So, Mr. Speaker, there are two reasons, I think two very distinct reasons, why I believe this is ill-conceived and that the Gilman motion should be supported.

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one clarification?

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

Mr. BERMAN. The Deputy Assistant Secretary under the administration's proposal would be responsible only for counterterrorism. It is the Assistant Secretary that would have the responsibilities for terrorism, narcotics, and——

Mr. SAXTON. That is correct; I am sorry if I misspoke. The gentleman is correct. But in effect we would have three departments rolled into one under one leader, and of course that is what those of us who think that this is ill-advised object to, and there are two reasons for this.

Mr. Speaker, the first and very distinct one is that the downgrading of this office would bury counter- terrorism in the battle against drugs. It would all be rolled into the same department.

The second distinct reason is that by downgrading this office, Mr. Speaker, the Clinton administration would send a signal that we have forgotten, to some degree at least, the bombings of the Marines in Lebanon and that we are not concerned, as much at least, with the future acts of Hamas, the Hezbollah, and Fatah, and others in our country and around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is very clear that those are two very distinct concerns that we need to address in conference. The threat of terrorism in the United States today is greater than it has ever been before.

The State Department, I believe, is wrong to focus on the number of terrorist incidents in this country and say that this move is OK because that number has not been great. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons that that number has been kept low is because we have been able, through our efforts, to uncover potential acts of terrorism, planned acts of terrorism, before they have taken place.

So, Mr. Speaker, by downgrading this office we send a message to the families of the victims of Pan Am 103, a bombing, that we are not interested in pursuing the perpetuators of these brutal murders as we perhaps at one time were. This is not a time to be scaling back on our efforts against terrorism, and so I believe we must bolster our efforts to prevent terrorist acts against Americans both here and abroad as in the Gilman language, and the Gilman motion, I believe, moves in that direction.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] for his supporting remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to note in response to the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] that an equivalent assistant secretary for counterterrorism was extremely helpful in being able to bring back to our country one of the defendants from Egypt to stand trial in New York for the World Trade Center bombing, and I would like to submit, Mr. Speaker, that this is the first recorded vote on our Government's position and posture toward international terrorism since the New York World Trade Center bombing occurred last February.

Mr. Speaker, this motion will help us maintain the independent, high level office of the coordinator for counterterrorism in the State Department, and without this amendment the State Department will reduce the counterterrorism office to a low-level deputy assistant secretary in an office handling both international narcotics and crime, and without it the State Department would downgrade the counterterrorism function at the very time the terrorism has come to American soil.

Do not let the State Department send a wrong signal to friends and foes alike around the globe that the threat of international terrorism is not a top priority of our own Government and our State Department. Please support the Gilman-Nadler-Solomon-Molinari amendment to H.R. 2333.

Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for another speaker who is supposed to be on his way.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN].

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I cannot oblige the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], but I have no more speakers.

Mr. GILMAN. Then, Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter from the Anti-Defamation League that was dated January 25, 1994. It is from the Klinghoffers, and we may recall that they were victims of terrorism, and they state on behalf of the Leon and Marilyn Klinghoffer Memorial Foundation of the Anti-Defamation League:

* * * we are writing to express our concern over the proposed State Department reorganization that would eliminate the independent office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism.

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

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

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I gather the gentleman is waiting for someone to come to the floor. I just want to say with all due respect, I think it is a little tortured to use the Klinghoffers' letter or the World Trade Center bombing, both of which occurred while there was a "high level coordinator of counterterrorism," the halcyon days which you are seeking to go back to, as an argument for why we should go back to them when these horrible incidents happened during that time. I think that buttresses the point that how you organize it is less important than what we do.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. BERMAN] for his remarks. there is no question that organization within the agency is the most effective way to approach it, but we do not want to bury it in with the massive problems that an office on crime and an office on narcotics would have which would detract from the time that would be taken from an administrator on counterterrorism.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the letter to which I referred from the Klinghoffer Foundation be made part of the RECORD.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The letter in its entirety is as follows:

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE
OF B'NAI B'RITH,
New York, NY, January 25, 1994.

DEAR SENATOR, on behalf of the Leon and Marilyn Klinghoffer Memorial Foundation of the Anti-Defamation League, we are writing to express our concern over the proposed State Department reorganization that would eliminate the independent office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism.

We welcome the President's demonstrated commitment to the fight against terrorism and respect to changing budgetary and political realities that pose new challenges to the State Department operations. However, we are concerned that the country's counterterrorism mission may be weakened when one Assistant Secretary is also responsible for such critical national priorities as narcotics and international crime—two areas that, individually, demand very substantial resources and attention.

At a time when the threat of international and domestic terrorism is growing, and at a time when terrorists have carried out attacks against the United States on our soil, the proposed delegation of responsibility for the Coordinator for Counterterrorism to a Deputy Assistant Secretary sends the wrong signal. We must avoid any suggestion that combatting terrorism is a diminishing national priority. We must do all we can to maintain U.S. credibility and effectiveness in dealing with foreign officials on this issue.

We urge the Senate to vote to maintain the integrity of a separate Office of Counterterrorism, headed by an Assistant Secretary-level official, to ensure the most effective implementation of the administration's counterterrorism policies and initiatives.

Sincerely,

LISA KLINGHOFFER and
ILSA KLINGHOFFER,
Leon and Marilyn Klinghoffer Memorial Foundation of the Anti-Defamation League.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, they concluded that they urge a vote to maintain the integrity of a separate office of counterterrorism headed by an assistant-secretary level official to make certain that there would be most effective implementation of the administration's counterterrorism policies and initiatives.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to instruct.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN].

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the nays appeared to have it.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 2, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—357

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Emerson
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Ford (MI)
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lloyd
Long
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynh
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NAYS—2

Kanjorski
Penny

NOT VOTING—73

Ackerman
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Blackwell
Burton
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman
Cooper
DeLay
Doolittle
Engel
English
Fields (TX)
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (TN)
Gallegly
Gallo
Goodling
Grandy
Gunderson
Hastings
Hefner
Houghton
Jefferson
Kaptur
Kleczka
Klug
Lehman
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowey
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
Mfume
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ridge
Rose
Rostenkowski
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Slattery
Stark
Stokes
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tauzin
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Valentine
Walsh
Washington
Wheat
Whitten
Young (FL)

□ 1738

Mr. PENNY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. SKEEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, because of a family illness, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall vote No. 113 regarding the motion to instruct on H.R. 2333, State Department authorization. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my Congressional district on official business and thus was not able to make rolecall vote No. 113, on instructing the conferees to retain the House position when in conference on the bill H.R. 2333, the State Department authorization.

Had I been here, I would have voted "aye."

□ 1740

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELAURO). The Chair will appoint conferees on House Concurrent Resolution 222 after the next vote.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the motion to instruct just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

RAOUL WALLENBERG BUST PLACEMENT IN THE U.S. CAPITOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 222.

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. ROSE] that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 222, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 0, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—358

Abercrombie
Allard
Andrews (ME)
Andrews (NJ)
Andrews (TX)
Applegate
Archer
Armey
Bacchus (FL)
Bachus (AL)
Baker (CA)
Ballenger
Barca
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Beilenson
Bentley
Bereuter
Berman
Bevill
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Bliley
Blute
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Borski
Boucher
Brewster
Brooks
Browder
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Buyer
Byrne
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cantwell
Cardin
Carr
Castle
Clayton
Clinger
Clyburn
Coble
Collins (GA)
Collins (IL)
Collins (MI)
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Coppersmith
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crapo
Cunningham
Danner
Darden
de la Garza
Deal
DeFazio
DeLauro
Dellums
Derrick
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Dooley
Dornan
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Durbin
Edwards (CA)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Emerson
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fawell
Fazio
Fields (LA)
Filner
Fingerhut
Flake
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (CT)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Furse
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Geren
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gingrich
Glickman
Gonzalez
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Grams
Green
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamburg
Hamilton
Hancock
Hansen
Harman
Hastert
Hayes
Hefley
Herger
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hoagland
Hobson
Hochbrueckner
Hoekstra
Hoke
Holden
Horn
Hoyer
Huffington
Hughes
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hutto
Hyde
Inglis
Inhofe
Inslee
Istook
Jacobs
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Johnston
Kanjorski
Kasich
Kennedy
Kennelly
Kildee
Kim
King
Kingston
Klein
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kopetski
Kreidler
Kyl
LaFalce
Lambert
Lancaster
Lantos
LaRocco
Laughlin
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Levy
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lightfoot
Linder
Lloyd
Long
Machtley
Maloney
Mann
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Matsui
Mazzoli
McCandless
McCloskey
McCrery
McCurdy
McDermott
McHale
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McMillan
McNulty
Meehan
Meek
Menendez
Meyers
Mica
Michel
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Mineta
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Molinari
Mollohan
Montgomery
Moorhead
Moran
Morella
Myers
Neal (MA)
Neal (NC)
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Orton
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Parker
Pastor
Paxon
Payne (VA)
Pelosi
Penny
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickett
Pickle
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Poshard
Price (NC)
Quillen
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Ravenel
Reed
Regula
Reynolds
Richardson
Roberts
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roth
Roukema
Rowland
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Sabo
Sarpalius
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaefer
Schenk
Schiff
Schroeder
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sharp
Shaw
Shays
Shepherd
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (IA)
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Snowe
Solomon
Spence
Spratt
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Studds
Stump
Stupak
Swift
Synar
Tanner
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Tejeda
Thomas (CA)
Thomas (WY)
Thompson
Thurman
Torkildsen
Torres
Traficant
Tucker
Unsoeld
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Volkmer
Vucanovich
Walker
Waters
Watt
Waxman
Weldon
Williams
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wyden
Wynn
Yates
Young (AK)
Zeliff
Zimmer

NOT VOTING—74

Ackerman
Baesler
Baker (LA)
Barlow
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Blackwell
Burton
Chapman
Clay
Clement
Coleman
Cooper
DeLay
Doolittle
Engel
English
Fields (TX)
Fish
Foglietta
Ford (MI)
Ford (TN)
Gallegly
Gallo
Goodling
Grandy
Gunderson
Hastings
Hefner
Houghton
Jefferson
Kaptur
Kleczka
Klug
Lehman
Lewis (FL)
Lipinski
Livingston
Lowey
Margolies-Mezvinsky
McCollum
McDade
McHugh
Mfume
Murphy
Murtha
Nadler
Owens
Payne (NJ)
Peterson (FL)
Portman
Pryce (OH)
Ridge
Rose
Rostenkowski
Sanders
Sangmeister
Santorum
Slattery
Stark
Stokes
Sundquist
Swett
Talent
Tauzin
Thornton
Torricelli
Towns
Valentine
Walsh
Washington
Wheat
Whitten
Young (FL)

□ 1756

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, because of a family illness, I was unavoidably absent during rollcall vote No. 114 regarding House Concurrent Resolution 222, the Raoul Wallenburg bust placement within the Capitol. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not present on Monday, April 18, 1994 to vote on rollcall vote No. 113 and No. 114. Had I been present I would have voted the following:

No. 113, House Concurrent Resolution 222 which would authorize the placement of the bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol, "yes."

No. 114, H.R. 2333, a motion to instruct conferees on the State Department authorization bill, "yes."

I believe we can ill-afford to downgrade our counterterrorism efforts by eliminating the counterterrorism desk at the State Department. I support Mr. GILMAN's efforts to ensure strong U.S. counterterrorism efforts.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, due to some pressing business in my congressional district in Baltimore, I was unable to be on the floor during the vote on House Concurrent Resolution 222, placing a bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol.

Mr. Wallenberg is an extremely deserving individual of this high praise, and had I been here I certainly would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained in my district on official business and was granted a leave of absence.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the Gilman motion to instruct House conferees on H.R. 2333 [Roll No. 113] to insist upon the provision contained in section 132(f) of the House bill relating to the continuation of the office of the Coordinator for Counterterrorism at the Department of State. I

had offered this language with my colleague from New York [Mr. GILMAN] when the House considered its version of the bill.

I would also have voted "yea" on House Concurrent Resolution 222 [Roll No. 114] to authorize the placement of a bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol. As a member of the Holocaust Memorial Council, and the congressional representative of the largest number of holocaust survivors in the country, I am pleased to join this unanimous House in supporting the placement of a bust to honor the distinguished work of that courageous diplomat.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, as a result of a death in my family, I missed two votes. Had I been in attendance, I would have voted "aye" on Rollcall votes numbers 113 and 114.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Due to an illness in my family, I was unable to attend House votes on April 18. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall votes 113, 114.

EXPLANATION OF MISSED ROLLCALL VOTE

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, I unavoidably missed rollcall votes No. 113 and No. 114. Had I been present I would have voted "aye" to House Concurrent Resolution 222 which would authorize the placement of the bust of Raoul Wallenberg in the Capitol. I would have also voted "aye" to H.R. 2333, a motion to instruct conferees on the State Department authorization bill.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2333, STATE DEPARTMENT, USIA, AND RELATED AGENCIES AUTHORIZATION ACT, FISCAL YEARS 1994 AND 1995

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. DELAURO). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2333:

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of the House bill (except sections 163, 167, 188, 190–93), and Senate amendment (except titles V, VI, IX–XV and sections 162–170E, 189, 701–22, 724–28, 730–31, 734–36, 774–46, 748–61, 763), and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HAMILTON, BERMAN, FALEOMAVAEGA, MARTINEZ, ANDREWS of New Jersey, MENENDEZ, LANTOS, JOHNSTON of Florida, and GILMAN, Ms. SNOWE, and Messrs. HYDE, DIAZ-BALART, and LEVY.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of sections 188, 190–93 of the House bill, and titles V, VI, IX–XII, and XIII–XIV, sections 163–64, 168–69, 189, 701–22, 724–26, 728, 730–31, 734–36, 744–46, 748–57, 759–61 and 763 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HAMILTON, GEJDENSON, LANTOS, TORRICELLI, BERMAN, ACKERMAN, JOHNSTON of Florida, FALEOMAVAEGA, GILMAN, and ROTH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. BEREUTER.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title XII, sections 727 and 758 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HAMILTON, GEJDENSON, LANTOS, TORRICELLI, BERMAN, ACKERMAN, JOHNSTON of Florida, FALEOMAVAEGA, GILMAN, and ROTH, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of sections 163 and 167 of the House bill, and title XV, sections 162, 165–67, 107A–E, and 190 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. HAMILTON, GEJDENSON, LANTOS, TORRICELLI, BERMAN, ACKERMAN, JOHNSTON of Florida, FALEOMAVAEGA, GILMAN and GOODLING, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. HYDE, and Mr. BEREUTER.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Armed Services, for consideration of section 170B, 170C(a), 170E(a), 721, 726(b)(2), 734, 749(b)(4), 760, 804, 810, and 1329 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. DELLUMS, SISISKY, SPRATT, SPENCE, and HUNTER.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs, for consideration of sections 759, 1003, 1104, and 1323–25 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. GONZALEZ, FRANK of Massachusetts, NEAL of North Carolina, LEACH, and BEREUTER.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of section 731 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. DINGELL, Mrs. COLLINS of Illinois, and Messrs. MANTON, MOORHEAD, and STEARNS.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Government Operations, for consideration of sections 189 and 721 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. CONYERS, SYNAR, CONDIT, CLINGER, and THOMAS of Wyoming.

As additional conferees from the Committee on the Judiciary, for consideration of section 133(n) of the House bill, and sections 136, 605, 704, 705, 723, 727, 748, 751, 758, 1201 and 1202 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. BROOKS, MAZZOLI, BRYANT, MCCOLLUM, and SMITH of Texas.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of section 164(c) of the House bill, and section 171(c) of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. MILLER of California, VENTO, DEFAZIO, YOUNG of Alaska and SMITH of Oregon.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, for consideration of sections 132(a), 133(e), 141–50, 254, 302(b) and 307 of the House bill, and sections 131, 141–53, 155, 229, 234, 309(h), 405(e), 407, 734, 747 and 814 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCCLOSKEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MYERS of Indiana, and Mrs. MORELLA.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Public Works and Transportation, for consideration of sections 764, 1104–05, and 1402(g) of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. MINETA, OBERSTAR, APPLEGATE, SHUSTER, and CLINGER.

As additional conferees from the Committee on Rules, for consideration of sections 714, 1003 and 1326 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. MOAKLEY, DERRICK, and SOLOMON.

There was no objection.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TRANSPORTATION EMPLOYEE EQUITABLE TREATMENT ACT OF 1994

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

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Speaker, most people think taxation without representation ended a few years after the Boston Tea Party. Well, it did not.

Those who work on America's waterways—on the Columbia and Mississippi Rivers, on the Great Lakes and along our seaboards—are subject to income taxes in States other than the one in which they reside. If their work takes them over a State line, they could be a victim of unfair taxation.

What makes this particularly objectionable is that air, rail, and road transportation workers are exempted from State income taxes except in their home States.

Today, I am introducing the Transportation Employee Equitable Treatment Act of 1994. My bill offers water carriers the same safeguard from unfair taxation that other transportation workers already enjoy.

I urge my colleagues to join in this effort to end taxation without representation. It is only fair.

□ 1800

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of California). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each further 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 on Tuesday, April 19, 1994.

ENVIRONMENTAL EXPORT PROMOTION ACT OF 1994

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3813) to amend the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 to promote further United States exports of environmental technologies, goods, and services as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3813

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 "Environmental Export Promotion Act of 1994".

SEC. 2. PROMOTION OF UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL EXPORTS.

(a) ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES TRADE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—Section 2313 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 (15 U.S.C. 4728) is amended—

(1) by striking subsection (d);

(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (e); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (b) the following:

"(c) ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES TRADE ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT AND PURPOSES.—The Secretary, in carrying out the duties of the chairperson of the TPCC, shall establish the Environmental Technologies Trade Advisory Committee (hereafter in the section referred to as the 'Committee'). The purpose of the Committee shall be to provide advice and guidance to the Working Group in the development and administration of programs to expand United States exports of environmental technologies, goods, and services.

"(2) MEMBERSHIP.—The members of the Committee shall be drawn from representatives of—

"(A) environmental businesses, including small businesses;

"(B) trade associations in the environmental sector;

"(C) private sector organizations involved in the promotion of environmental exports;

"(D) States (as defined in section 2301(i)(5)) and associations representing the States; and

"(E) other appropriate interested members of the public.

The Secretary shall appoint as members of the Committee at least 1 individual under each of subparagraphs (A) through (E).

"(d) EXPORT PLANS FOR PRIORITY COUNTRIES.—

"(1) PRIORITY COUNTRY IDENTIFICATION.—The Working Group, in consultation with the Committee, shall annually assess which foreign countries have markets with the greatest potential for the export of United States environmental technologies, goods, and services, Of these countries the Working Group shall select as priority countries 5 with the greatest potential for the application of United States Government export promotion resources related to environmental exports.

"(2) EXPORT PLANS.—The Working Group, in consultation with the Committee, shall annually create a plan for each priority country selected under paragraph (1), setting forth in detail ways to increase United States environmental exports to such country. Each such plan shall—

"(A) identify the primary public and private sector opportunities for United States exporters of environmental technologies, goods, and services in the priority country;

"(B) analyze the financing and other requirements for major projects in the priority country which will use environmental technologies, goods, and services, and analyze whether such projects are dependent upon financial assistance from foreign countries or multilateral institutions; and

"(C) list specific actions to be taken by the member agencies of the Working Group to increase United States exports to the priority country.".

(b) ADDITIONAL MECHANISMS TO PROMOTE ENVIRONMENTAL EXPORTS.—Section 2313 of the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES SPECIALISTS IN THE UNITED STATES AND FOREIGN COMMERCIAL SERVICE.—

"(1) ASSIGNMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES SPECIALISTS.—The Secretary shall assign a specialist in environmental technologies to the office of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service in each of the 5 priority countries selected under subsection (d)(1), and the Secretary is authorized to assign such a specialist to the office of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service in any country that is a promising market for United States exports of environmental technologies, goods, and services. Such specialist may be an employee of the Department, an employee of any relevant United States Government department or agency assigned on a temporary or limited term basis to the Commerce Department, or a representative of the private sector assigned to the Department of Commerce.

"(2) DUTIES OF ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES SPECIALISTS.—Each specialist assigned under paragraph (1) shall provide export promotion assistance to United States environmental businesses, including, but not limited to—

"(A) identifying factors in the country to which the specialist is assigned that affect the United States share of the domestic market for environmental technologies, goods, and services, including market barriers, standards-setting activities, and financing issues;

"(B) providing assessments of assistance by foreign governments that is provided to producers of environmental technologies, goods, and services in such countries in order to enhance exports to the country to which the specialist is assigned, the effectiveness of such assistance on the competitiveness of United States products, and whether comparable United States assistance exists;

"(C) training Foreign Commercial Service Officers in the country to which the specialist is assigned, other countries in the region, and United States and Foreign Commercial Service offices in the United States, in environmental technologies and the international environmental market;

"(D) providing assistance in identifying potential customers and market opportunities in the country to which the specialist is assigned;

"(E) providing assistance in obtaining necessary business services in the country to which the specialist is assigned;

"(F) providing information on environmental standards and regulations in the country to which the specialist is assigned; and

"(G) providing information on all United States Government programs that could assist the promotion, financing, and sale of United States environmental technologies, goods, and services in the country to which the specialist is assigned.

"(g) ENVIRONMENTAL TRAINING IN ONE-STOP SHOPS.—In addition to the training provided under subsection (f)(2)(C), the Secretary shall establish a mechanism to train—

"(1) Commercial Service Officers assigned to the one-stop shops provided for in section 2301(b)(8); and

"(2) Commercial Service Officers assigned to district offices in districts having large numbers of environmental businesses, in environmental technologies and in the international environmental marketplace, and ensure that such officers receive appropriate training under such mechanism. Such training may be provided by officers or employees of the Department of Commerce, and other United States Government departments and agencies, with appropriate expertise in environmental technologies and the international environmental workplace, and by appropriate representatives of the private sector.

"(h) INTERNATIONAL REGIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL INITIATIVES.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT OF INITIATIVES.—The TPCC shall establish one or more international regional environmental initiatives the purpose of which shall be to coordinate the activities of Federal departments and agencies in order to build environmental partnerships between the United States and the geographic region outside the United States for which such initiative is established. Such partnerships shall enhance environmental protection and promote sustainable development by using in the region technical expertise and financial resources of United States departments and agencies that provide foreign assistance and by expanding United States exports of environmental technologies, goods, and services to that region.

"(2) ACTIVITIES.—In carrying out each international regional environmental initiative, the TPCC shall—

"(A) support, through the provision of foreign assistance, the development of sound environmental policies and practices in countries in the geographic region for which the initiative is established, including the development of environmentally sound regulatory regimes and enforcement mechanisms;

"(B) identify and disseminate to United States environmental businesses information regarding specific environmental business opportunities in that geographic region;

"(C) coordinate existing Federal efforts to promote environmental exports to that geographic region, and ensure that such efforts are fully coordinated with environmental export promotion efforts undertaken by the States and the private sector;

"(D) increase assistance provided by the Federal Government to promote exports from the United States of environmental technologies, goods, and services to that geographic region, such as trade missions, reverse trade missions, trade fairs, and programs in the United States to train foreign nationals in United States environmental technologies; and

"(E) increase high-level advocacy by United States Government officials (including the United States ambassadors to the countries in that geographic region) for United States environmental businesses seeking market opportunities in that geographic region.

"(i) ENVIRONMENTAL TECHNOLOGIES PROJECT ADVOCACY CALENDAR AND INFORMATION DISSEMINATION PROGRAM.—The Working Group shall maintain a calendar, updated at the end of each calendar quarter, of significant opportunities for United States environmental businesses in foreign markets and trade promotion events, which shall be made available to the public. Such calendar shall—

"(1) identify the 50 to 100 environmental infrastructure and procurement projects in foreign markets that have the greatest potential in the calendar quarter for United States exports of environmental technologies, goods, and services; and

"(2) include trade promotion events, such as trade missions and trade fairs, in the environmental sector.

The Working Group shall also provide, through the National Trade Data Bank and other information dissemination channels, information on opportunities for environmental businesses in foreign markets and information on Federal export promotion programs.

"(j) REGIONAL CENTERS.—The Secretary, through the Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Director General of the United States and Foreign Commercial Service, is authorized to provide matching funds for the establishment in the United States of regional environmental business and technology cooperation centers that will draw upon the expertise of the private sector and institutions of higher education and existing Federal programs to provide export promotion assistance related to environmental technologies, goods, and services.

"(k) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'environmental business' means a business that produces environmental technologies, goods, or services.".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, under an agreement with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ROTH], I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. STUDDS] who has played a very important role in this legislation.

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his kindness.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of this bill and avid proponent of the programs it establishes to promote U.S. exports of environmental technologies, goods, and services, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3813.

I wish to especially thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment for his cooperation in crafting this legislation. It has been a pleasure working with Mr. GEJDENSON and with Ms. FURSE on this proposal.

H.R. 3813 shares a common goal with legislation Congresswoman FURSE and I introduced last year—the National Environmental Trade Development Act of 1993—H.R. 2112—and that is to help U.S. companies export their environmental products and services and to help other countries solve their environmental problems.

This legislation is needed if American businesses are to take advantage of the growing global market for environmental technologies. The market stands at $200 billion a year now, and experts project that it will grow to close to $600 billion by the year 2000. The United States, which pioneered the concept of strong environmental protection laws, must be in the forefront of capturing this market. If we establish a viable public-private partnership, we can take advantage of the expanding market for environmental technologies and create as many as 30,000 new jobs in this country.

In Massachusetts alone, there are over 1,300 companies employing over 40,000 people in "green" businesses. Many of these companies have been leaders in the development of environmental technologies. They have developed ways to recycle laundry grey water, have developed a method using the natural properties of plants and sunlight to treat sewage, and, in the case of Molten Metals, have figured out how to safely recycle chemical waste. I applaud their ingenuity and support their efforts with this legislation.

The New England region has also been at the forefront of recognizing the importance of overseas markets for the sale of U.S. environmental technologies. New England companies and institutions, including the University of Massachusetts, have formed the Environmental Business Council of New England and launched the Environmental Business Council of the United States, the first truly national trade association for "green" companies. The efforts and foresight of the EBC under the wise leadership of Don Connors and Jack Driscoll have brought us to where we are today. I applaud their efforts as well as those of President Michael Hooker of the University of Massachusetts who has played a key role in linking the university and industry in promoting environmental technology and business.

The Gejdenson-Studds-Furse bill supports the public-private partnership that the EBC and others have already begun. I wish to point out two principal examples of how the legislation does this. One is the creation of the Environmental Technologies Trade Advisory Committee, a committee of business, State, and private sector organizations, that will advise the Secretary of Commerce and other agencies involved in export promotion on how to expand U.S. exports of environmental technologies, goods, and services. The committee will also help identify five priority countries with the greatest potential for acquiring U.S. environmental exports and develop a marketing plan for each priority country.

The other significant way the bill fosters a public-private partnership is by sponsoring Regional Environmental Business and Technology Cooperation Centers. These centers, to be funded by matching grants from the Commerce Department, will be run by the private sector. They will provide hands-on technical assistance to environmental businesses in the region they serve on how to export their products as well as provide training to foreign nationals on uses of U.S. products and services. States like Massachusetts and Oregon where environmental companies are already clustered are ideal locations to try out the regional center concept.

Finally, I wish to point out that the bill is consistent with the administration's own environmental export strategy, which it released last November at a ceremony in which representatives of Massachusetts companies and I were pleased to participate. There is no doubt Secretary Ron Brown and the Clinton administration recognize the need to help U.S. companies promote their products and services overseas by finding new and innovative ways for the Government and the private sector to work together. Passage of this bill will help the administration move its strategy forward.

I am proud to be associated with this legislation and urge my colleagues to support its passage in the House.

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

Mr. Speaker, the U.S. economy is littered with industries that have fallen victim to unfair trade practices and to the high levels of export assistance provided by other countries. For decades, the U.S. Government simply waited too long to go to bat for key sectors of our economy on the international trade front.

Today, we have an opportunity to work with the administration to change this pattern of failure. In considering H.R. 3813, the Environmental Export Promotion Act, Congress has an opportunity to help ensure the continued vitality of the U.S. environmental sector in the international marketplace. We also have an opportunity to protect jobs here at home.

This legislation grew out of hearings held by the Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade and Environment, which I chair. Unlike many of the subcommittee's hearings, the Government and private-sector witnesses actually arrived at strikingly similar conclusions.

First, the United States had a $4 billion trade surplus in the environmental sector in 1990, but our major competitors are gaining fast. The American environmental industry must not be allowed to lose its competitive position.

Second, environmental exports not only help American firms and American workers, but also help to protect the global environmental. We all benefit from the diffusion on state-of-the-

art environmental technology to developing countries.

Third, the international market for environmental goods and services is growing rapidly. It currently stands at $270 billion annually, and is likely to grow to $400–$600 billion by the end of the decade.

If U.S. firms manage to capture 20 percent of the growth anticipated in the overseas environmental market, an estimated 300,000 new American jobs will be created over the next 7 years. In my home State of Connecticut, for instance, increased envirotech exports will increase employment at over 500 environmental firms throughout the State.

Based upon these three conclusions, I introduced the Environmental Export Promotion Act, which is before the House today. I would like to thank Representative LEE HAMILTON and Representative BEN GILMAN, the chairman and ranking Republican member of the committee, for moving this bill through the committee, as well as Representative TOBY ROTH for his leadership on this issue.

I would also like to recognize the leadership of Representative GERRY STUDDS, the chairman of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, and Representatives ELIZABETH FURSE, MARIA CANTWELL, and JAN MEYERS, all of whom joined me in introducing this legislation.

H.R. 3813, as amended, is designed to fine-tune the U.S. Government's export promotion efforts to increase environmental exports. The bill, in large part, is drawn from recommendations made by the administration in its November 1993 report on this issue.

Since the Foreign Affairs Committee ordered H.R. 3813 reported, the committee has made five minor changes in the text of the bill. At this time, I would like to introduce into the RECORD an exchange of letters between Chairman HAMILTON and Chairman DINGELL.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, April 15, 1994.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR LEE: Thank for your letter concerning H.R. 3813, the "Environmental Export Promotion Act of 1994," which was ordered reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 16, 1994.

As you indicated, the Committee on Energy and Commerce requested sequential referral of the bill because it included matters within the jurisdiction of this Committee. I understand that you plan to offer an amended version when the bill is considered on the suspension calendar. Those changes, which have been worked out with this Committee, are welcome. Accordingly, we will not insist on sequential referral. If, as you note, the Senate does not accept the House bill as amended and requests a conference, we understand that we would be represented in that conference. I appreciate the opportunity to work out these matters with you.

With every good wish.

Sincerely,

JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman.

U.S. CONGRESS,
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC, April 15, 1994.

Hon. JOHN D. DINGELL,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR JOHN: The Committee on Energy and Commerce has raised various jurisdictional concerns regarding H.R. 3813, as ordered reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs on March 16, 1994.

Pursuant to discussions between the staff of our committees, the text of H.R. 3813 to be considered by the House contains several changes, reflected in the attached text, from the amendment in the nature of a substitute that the Committee on Foreign Affairs ordered reported. if the Senate approves legislation with provisions in the areas in which the Committees on Energy and Commerce has raised concerns, the Committee on Foreign Affairs would not object to the placement of conferees from the Energy and Commerce Committee on those provisions of the Senate bill.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Chairman.

Mr. GEJDENSON. H.R. 3813, as modified: establishes an Environment Technologies Trade Advisory Committee to guide Federal environmental export promotion activities; requires the annual designation of five priority countries whose markets have the greatest potential for U.S. environmental exports, and a plan to help U.S. firms capture those five markets must then be developed; requires the Commerce Secretary to place environmental specialists in the five priority markets; authorizes international environmental initiatives to encourage other regions to adopt American-style environmental standards and to buy U.S. environmental products; establishes an environmental technologies project advocacy calendar containing an updated list of all major overseas environmental projects; and, authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to provide matching funds for regional centers promoting environmental exports.

The legislation will help to ensure that American environmental companies remain on the cutting edge of the international environmental marketplace. It will also help to create export-related jobs here at home.

I urge my colleagues to support its passage.

□ 1810

Mr. Speaker, before reserving my time, I would like to take this opportunity to point out that one of the things that moved me in moving this piece of legislation was when my colleague who now sits in the chair, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], returned from the International Conference on Environment in Brazil, with the great frustration that he had, indicating that the Japanese were there marketing their products while America virtually had no presence. We need to make sure that in these areas where we have such a technological advantage, that we stay active and get our products known.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this legislation, the Environmental Export Promotion Act, I join our chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], in thanking the chairman of our full committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member, and all those people who have worked on this legislation. I also thank the chairman, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], for his kind remarks, and the feeling is mutual.

Chairman GEJDENSON shows real leadership on our subcommittee, and that is one of the reasons that we have been able to pass, in the last number of years, such legislation that has promoted so many jobs here in America.

Mr. Speaker, this measure is the product of close bipartisan cooperation among all the members of our Subcommittee on Economic Policy.

This bill is in keeping with the focus of our subcommittee, which is to create new jobs for American workers by expanding American exports, because we realize if we want to have good jobs here in America, we have got to be able to export our products.

In the last Congress, our subcommittee produced two measures that, according to Commerce Department estimates, are adding 100,000 new jobs for American workers. In this Congress, our subcommittee is again working on legislation to create more jobs.

During the past year we held a series of hearings on how to add new jobs by expanding our exports. The bill before us today is the first of several measures that our subcommittee will bring to the House this year to create jobs through exports.

In this bill, we strengthen the export promotion for environmental technologies. As our hearings last year showed, the United States is a world leader in environmental technology.

American companies now hold nearly half of the total world market—which is now $300 billion a year.

So we are talking about big money and big job opportunities. By the end of the decade, this world market will double—to $600 billion a year.

But other nations have discovered this market.

Our competitors in this field—Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the Nordic countries—all are moving to increase their exports of environmental

technology. Their goal is to take market share away from American exporters.

If American companies are to stay on top, then we have to strengthen our own export promotion efforts.

The payoff is that if we can maintain our share of this rapidly expanding market, we will add some 300,000 new jobs for American workers.

Our bill reflects the findings of two recent authoritative reports: One by the Office of Technology Assessment, and the second by an interagency group headed by the Commerce Department.

As recommended, our bill has three key provisions: First, it requires that export promotion assistance is targeted at the five top markets for this technology.

This will give us the biggest return on our export promotion effort.

Second, our bill requires closer coordination of the Federal Export Promotion Programs with State and local agencies.

Third, our bill strengthens the expertise available in our overseas missions to our environmental technology exporters.

This will give American firms more help on the ground in these overseas markets.

Finally, let me emphasize that this bill does not add any new Federal spending.

Instead, it redirects existing resources into the field, to give us a bigger return on our export promotion investment.

This is a well-crafted bill that will help our exporters and create new jobs for American workers.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this measure.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington [Ms. CANTWELL], who has really been one of the architects helping us to put this and a number of other initiatives on the subcommittee together.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a moment this afternoon to applaud the manager of this legislation for his leadership. Mr. GEJDENSON has provided us with what I think will be one of the most important economic bills impacting my State's environmental industries in this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is no one in this body who better understands the need to marry international environmental protection with the promotion of our own environmental technology industries than Mr. GEJDENSON. I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this effort.

With the leadership of President Clinton, Vice President GORE, and congressional leaders like Mr. GEJDENSON and Mr. ROTH and Mr. GILMAN, the ranking member of the subcommittee and committee, I believe we have finally reached an understanding that environmental protection and economic growth are not mutually exclusive.

Increasingly, foreign nations and companies are relying on U.S. environmental technology, products, and services to help them solve environmental problems. By supporting environmental protection internationally, we can create the very world markets that our environmental technology firms need to grow and expand.

This is particularly true in my home State of Washington. Washington has been a national leader in promoting its environmental technology industry. Washington's environmental industry currently includes more than 450 firms, employing 27,000 people with annual revenues estimated at more than $3 billion.

These firms vary from solid and hazardous waste management to lab testing and analysis.

This bill is strongly supported by environmental community and by environmental technology companies. It incorporates the best steps we can take today to help promote both environmental protection and economic growth.

I urge my colleagues to support final passage.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the ranking member on our committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support for this legislation H.R. 3813 which should benefit American exporters of environmental technology by identifying key overseas markets and by directing Government agencies to provide hands on assistance to our companies trying to enter those markets. I commend the gentleman from Connecticut, the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of Economic Parity, Trade and Environment and its ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. ROTH] for their extensive work in bringing this measure to the floor.

This legislation enacts proposals contained in the industry, technology and environment study undertaken by the Office of Technology Assessment and directs the administration to create regional environmental initiatives.

One such initiative, the United States-Asia Environmental Partnership, was created in 1989 under the Bush administration to increase our environmental exports to Asian countries and to encourage them to adopt compatible standards and technologies.

It is my understanding that the version of the legislation we are considering today reflects the minor changes requested by the Energy and Commerce Committee. To avoid a sequential referral of this legislation, its provisions have been changed to include only those entities and activities in the exclusive domain of the Foreign Affairs Committee and to delete any superfluous reference to the trade coordinating role of the Secretary of Commerce.

Accordingly, I urge the adoption of this legislation.

Mr. ROTH. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. BEREUTER], and I thank him for the tremendous contribution he makes. He does his homework, understands all the nuances of the bill and amendments, and it is a real pleasure to yield to my friend from Nebraska.

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

Mr. Speaker, this Member rises in support of H.R. 3813, the Environmental Export promotion Act. This legislation, better coordinates the Federal Government's promotion of U.S. environmental technology, goods, and services to the world's developing countries.

Mr. Speaker, the global market for environmental technology, goods, and services is growing at an unprecedented rate. By the year 2000, the OECD expects this infant market to reach $300 billion annually.

Although the United States has traditionally enjoyed a substantial trade surplus in environmental technologies, goods, and services, other industrialized countries including France, Germany, and Japan have also recognized this lucrative and growing market and are aggressively promoting their own environmental technology, goods, and services.

Mr. Speaker, our competitors are focusing their efforts on developing countries where 95 percent of the world's population growth is expected to occur in the next 30 years. They are aggressively competing for emerging markets in China and India where one-third of the world's population currently live and where 1 billion more people are expected to live in 30 years. And Mr. Speaker, our competitors are directing their efforts at the world's rapidly emerging megacities and urban areas where over half of the world's population will live by the end of the century.

Clearly, the greatest future demand for U.S. environmental exports, including the services of U.S. engineers, scientists, and technicians, will come from the developing world. Emerging megacities will desperately need the housing, sanitation, transportation, communication, and power generation facilities in order to prepare them for the 21st century.

Unfortunately, while U.S. engineers, contractors, and exporters already recognize this great potential, I am afraid

that until recently our Federal Government and our foreign policy initiatives for the developing world have not sufficiently recognized this potential.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Export Promotion Act is a good first step toward the aggressive promotion of this leading U.S. industrial sector. This legislation carefully refines our environmental export promotion strategy by establishing an Environmental Technologies Trade Advisory Committee to guide promotion activities and to designate priority countries whose markets have the greatest potential for U.S. environmental exports of services and goods.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the Environmental Trade Advisory Committee will promote and encourage emerging markets to adopt U.S. environmental standards, and it will monitor major overseas environmental projects so it can quickly alert U.S. environmental technology, goods, and service exporters to potential procurement and contract opportunities.

Mr. Speaker, the World Resources Institute recently predicted that the United States would lose its competitive lead in environmental technology if it failed to respond to the challenge of our foreign competitors. Because we cannot afford to lose another vast and lucrative market to foreign competition, this Member commends the chairman of the House Foreign Affairs. Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade, and the Environment, Mr. GEJDENSON, and the ranking minority member, Mr. ROTH, for their farsighted and excellent work in crafting this legislature to promote America's environmental exports.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3813.

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3813, the Environmental Export Promotion Act of 1994. I am an original cosponsor of this important legislation which marks the culmination of an effort which began a year ago when Chairman STUDDS of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and I introduced the National Environmental Trade Development Act, H.R. 2112. The intent of H.R. 2112 was to help U.S. companies increase exportation of environmental goods and services across the globe, and bolster their already formidable presence in this increasingly important market. We were greatly assisted this year by the commitment and dedication to this issue of my good friend from Connecticut, Mr. GEJDENSON of the Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Economic Policy, Trade, and the Environment. The Environmental Export Promotion Act before the House today is the result of our collaboration, and this bill is important because it proves that protecting and enhancing our environment works hand-in-hand with job creation. Because of this bill, countries all across the globe will no longer be forced to look the other way when faced with serious environmental problems; they will have American envirotech businesses knocking on their door with solutions.

I would like to cite a few remarkable numbers with regard to job creation and environmental technologies, goods, and services. In my home State of Oregon, the 400 envirotech companies currently employ nearly 14,000 people. Moreover, the average salary paid in the envirotech field is around $31,000—nearly $9,000 higher than the next closest industry. Both numbers will grow in the next 10 years. In fact, all signs point to a boom before the turn of the century for U.S. environmental technology companies. The global envirotech market is currently worth $200 billion a year, and is expected to reach $600 billion over the next 6 years. Hundreds of American companies currently have a substantial lead over their foreign competitors in the production of environmental technologies, goods, and services. The challenge we faced was to link all American envirotech businesses—from large corporations to small, entrepreneurial startups—with opportunities for success in the global marketplace. The bottom line is that we needed to help these businesses that have created the new technologies and services find direct access to the world markets that are open for business. We needed—and this bill delivers—a clearly defined national commitment to environmental technologies.

I have been concerned from the beginning that any environmental technology legislation passed by this Congress be driven by the private sector. No export strategy can be successful unless the private sector has a primary role in its development. As the primary beneficiary of a national environmental technology policy, businesses know what they need to be successful. For too long, Government has either been too intrusive or too hands-off. It is time to have a policy which acknowledges that taxpayers deserve to get a return on their investment, and that business has to be part of the solution. Business executives and entrepreneurs are traveling the globe to clean up the mess left behind by years of misuse and neglect. The Gejdenson-Studds-Furse bill ensures that our role is to help—not hinder—these people of vision.

I am pleased to report that this legislation achieves our laudable goals in a number of important ways. First, the Environmental Export Promotion Act increases American businesses' access to foreign envirotech markets. It establishes a true public-private partnership to ensure that Federal agencies and private business work in concert with one another to tap these markets. It ensures that information is made available to companies which can use it, and does so with a coordinated approach. Lastly, this legislation establishes regional environmental business and technology cooperation centers to provide technical assistance to envirotech companies in their region. These centers will help existing envirotech businesses in export promotion and foster regional strengths within environmental trade.

Across the country, firms in the envirotech business are creating associations and consortiums to help disseminate information about global environmental opportunities. Businesses in Oregon and Massachusetts, for example, are already working together to help foster an informational network to promote envirotech. The Environmental Export Promotion Act realizes the importance of these associations, and works with the private sector to maximize these relationships. The Oregon Environmental Technology Association [OETA] from my home State has played an important role in the development of this legislation. Personally, I would like to thank Bill Snyder of the OETA who has contributed his expertise and his hard work to this effort.

I would also like to point out that in addition to working well with the private sector, this bill is consistent with the administration's environmental export strategy which was released last November. I have spoken on a number of occasions with Vice President GORE about this legislation; he is committed to environmental technology as part of our Nation's future. I have had numerous discussions with the Department of Commerce, including Secretary Brown, on how we can all work together on a coordinated environmental export policy. Dr. Katherine Sullivan, chair of the interagency environmental technologies exports working group, did a great job in putting together the Commerce Department's role in environmental trade. The Gejdenson-Studds-Furse bill fits in perfectly with the goals of the working group and the efforts that have been undertaken in the administration.

By the way, the legislation before us today will help crate literally thousands of private-sector, high-wage jobs in our Nation by increasing environmental exports. These are the types of jobs that prove that helping our environment is not a zero-sum game. When you use environmental technologies to help restore land which has been rendered useless from contamination, for example, you pay the salaries of the envirotech firms which develop effective environmental products or services, you pay the salaries of the people who work and use that technology to clean up the land, and the entire community regains an asset. Investing in the development and export environmental technologies, goods, and services is our future—both here in the United States and the world.

I am proud to have committed so much of my time in my first term in Congress to passage of this legislation. The Environmental Export Promotion Act is our first step into the future, and I urge all my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 3813, the Environmental Export Promotion Act.

□ 1820

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3813, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceed-

ings on this motion will be postponed until Tuesday, April 19, 1994.

CONCERNING THE EMANCIPATION OF THE IRANIAN BAHA'I COMMUNITY

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31) concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i community.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 31

Whereas in 1982, 1984, 1988, 1990, and 1992, the Congress, by concurrent resolution, declared that it holds the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all its nationals, including members of the Baha'i Faith, Iran's largest religious minority;

Whereas in such resolutions and in numerous other appeals, the Congress condemned the Government of Iran's religious persecution of the Baha'i community, including the execution of more than 200 Baha'is, the imprisonment of additional thousands, and other repressive and discriminatory actions against Baha'is based solely upon their religious beliefs;

Whereas in 1992, the Government of Iran summarily executed a leading member of the Baha'i community, arrested and imprisoned several other Baha'is, condemned two Baha'i prisoners to death on account of their religion, and confiscated individual Baha'is' homes and personal properties in several cities;

Whereas the Government of Iran continues to deny the Baha'i community the right to organize, to elect its leaders, to hold community property for worship or assembly, to operate religious schools and to conduct other normal religious community activities; and

Whereas on February 22, 1993, the United Nations Commission on Human Rights published a formerly confidential Iranian government document constituting a blueprint for the destruction of the Baha'i community, which document reveals that these repressive actions are the result of a deliberate policy designed and approved by the highest officials of the Government of Iran: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Congress—

(1) continues to hold the government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all its nationals, including members of the Baha'i community, in a manner consistent with Iran's obligations under the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international agreements guaranteeing the civil and political rights of its citizens;

(2) condemns the repressive anti-Baha'i policy adopted by the Government of Iran, as set forth in a confidential official document which explicitly states that Baha'is shall be denied access to education and employment, and that the government's policy is to deal with Baha'is "in such a way that their progress and development are blocked";

(3) expresses concern that individual Baha'is continue to suffer from severely repressive and discriminatory government actions, solely on account of their religion; and that the Baha'i community continues to be denied legal recognition and the basic rights to organize, elect its leaders, educate its youth, and conduct the normal activities of a law-abiding religious community;

(4) urges the Government of Iran to extend to the Baha'i community the rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the international covenants on human rights, including the freedom of thought, conscience, and religious, and equal protection of the law; and

(5) calls upon the President to continue—

(A) to emphasize that the United States regards the human rights practices of the Government of Iran, particularly its treatment of the Baha'i community and other religious minorities, as a significant factor in the development of the United States Government's relations with the Government of Iran;

(B) to urge the Government of Iran to emancipate the Baha'i community by granting those rights guaranteed by the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the international covenants on human rights; and

(C) to encourage other governments to continue to appeal to the Government of Iran, and to cooperate with other governments and international organizations, including the United Nations and its agencies, in efforts to protect the religious rights of the Baha'is and other minorities through joint appeals to the Government of Iran and through other appropriate actions.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Senate shall transmit a copy of this concurrent resolution to the President.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON].

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for bringing this important resolution to the attention of the House.

This resolution states that the Congress continues to hold the Government of Iran responsible for upholding the rights of all nationals, including members of the Baha'i community, consistent with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and other international agreements; condemns the repressive policies adopted by the Government of Iran toward members of the Baha'i community; and calls on the President to emphasize the human rights practices of the Government of Iran as a significant factor in the development of United States relations with that Government.

Mr. Speaker, the horrendous treatment of the Baha'i community by the Government of Iran has been addressed by this House before. We need to condemn this outrageous treatment at every opportunity.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, concerning the emancipation of the Iranian Baha'i community, is the latest in a series of resolutions concerning the continuing repression of the Baha'i community in Iran that have been adopted by the Congress since 1982. This resolution allows us once again to express our outrage and revulsion with regard to the brutal and systematic denial of one of the most basic of human freedoms—freedom of conscience—which has been denied by the Mullahs of Iran.

Each time we consider these resolutions it seems that there has been a new twist added to the outrages Iranian authorities have perpetrated against their own citizens. During the past year, we received disturbing reports from Iran on the continued repression of the Baha'i community. We learned that the Tehran authorities have destroyed gravesites located in the principal Baha'i cemetery in Tehran. Bodies have been removed to unknown destinations, and grave markers have been sold to construction firms to be used as ordinary building stones. The municipal authorities reportedly intend to build a cultural center on the site of the cemetery.

These acts are consistent with guidelines detailed in a secret Iranian Government plan which came to light last year which calls for suppression of the Baha'i community in Iran and the destruction of its cultural roots. It is frighteningly similar to Hitler's plans for dealing with the Jewish community in Germany.

The desecration of the Baha'i cemetery in Tehran is not only a despicable attempt by the Iranian Government to add to the misery of the living by denying to their loved ones interred at this site the respect that all civilized peoples accord to the dead, but an attempt to obliterate the heritage of the Baha'i and all traces of their culture which originated in Iran.

The United States has spoken out consistently and repeatedly on Iran's continued brutal repression of the Baha'i. In its latest Human Rights Report, the State Department includes Iran among the few countries that are the very worst abusers of the rights of their own citizens in the world. We owe it to the victims of these repressive regimes to continue to raise this issue in international human rights forums, and to press those governments that conduct commerce and diplomatic relations with the Government of Iran to use their influence and speak out against these outrages.

Resolutions of the Congress, such as the one we now consider, representing the clear voice of the American people, are an invaluable tool for our diplomats in bodies such as the U.N. Human Right Commission. I hope my colleagues on this Committee will join me in supporting Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, which is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 124.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gen-

tleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] who, along with the distinguished cochair of the Human Rights Caucus, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], has worked to keep this issue alive before the Congress.

□ 1830

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very able colleague, a leader on human rights issues throughout all of his service in the Congress, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 124, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILMAN], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON], and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], for their support in bringing this measure, Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, to the floor of the House.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, the Baha'i Community Emancipation Resolution, condemns the Government of Iran for denying the 300,000 strong Baha'i community their basic human rights. Since the fundamentalist Islamic regime took power in 1979, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of Baha'is, the largest religious minority in Iran, have been executed, and thousands have been imprisoned because of their religion. Many have disappeared or been kidnapped.

Because the regime does not recognize the Baha'i faith, calling it a conspiracy and a heresy, tens of thousands of Baha'is are deprived of jobs, housing, school, and other social services in Iran.

Intolerance, Mr. Speaker, religious, ethnic, sexual, and racial, has been the hallmark of far too much of our world with the end of the cold war, motivation for strife in many places where the cold war previously had kept such intolerance in check.

Iran in particularly, since it turned away from moderation and modernization toward fundamentalism, has become a paradigm of intolerance.

What if the United States were to follow Iran's model and declare Islam, not nearly so old as either Christianity or Judaism, as the Iranians have declared Baha'ism, a heresy, and therefore all Moslems heretics, to be discriminated against at will by the government and by private citizens alike in our country? Mr. Speaker, what a disaster that would be.

Intolerance is the trail of the backward, the ignorant, and the insecure. In Iran, intolerance of Baha'is, people who threaten no one, who accede to legitimate civil authority wherever they define, reside, defines not the Baha'is, but the Iranian fundamentalists for what they are.

Mr. Speaker, the Baha'i religion is in fact founded upon the nine dominant religions of the world, including, of course, Islam, and draws on the best of all of them as the basis of its faith. What irony there is in the fact that the Iranians, in the name of Islam, repress Baha'is, who in reality respect and revere their religion more than the Iranians do.

While in the mid-1980's diplomatic pressure and negative publicity forced the Iranian leadership to lessen the severity of their grievous official campaign against the Baha'is, there are disturbing signals that the repression of the Baha'is has increased greatly in this past year.

Last summer the Baha'i cemetery in Iran was desecrated by local officials, who decided to build a community center on the site of Baha'i graves, a particularly reprehensible and unseemly act.

In September, two Iranians were found guilty of murdering a Baha'i, but did not face retribution because their victim was a member of the Baha'i community, a nonrecognized religious sect.

As recently as last December, three Baha'is were condemned to death because of apostasy or of being unprivileged infidels at war with the Moslem nation.

A year ago, an official government document obtained in Iran confirmed for the first time that the ongoing persecution of the Baha'i community has been a calculated policy, written and approved by Iran's highest officials.

This document reveals that the official Iranian policy is to repress Baha'is at every opportunity, while maintaining plausible deniability.

While it says they will not be expelled or arrested without reason, it makes evident that the Iranian Government's intent is to isolate, persecute, and ultimately destroy the Baha'is in Iran.

The resolution that we are considering today condemns the document's plan to confront and destroy Baha'i cultural roots outside of Iran, something that is tantamount to a program of cultural genocide.

The response of the United States and civilized world to this document must be clear: So long as it continues its calculated persecution of the Baha'is and rejects basic human rights, Iran will continue to be ostracized from the community of nations.

These revelations mean that any discussion of Iran renewing ties with the West is completely out of the question. The Congressional Human Rights Caucus, which I cochair along with my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. LANTOS], has written to parliamentarians in countries around the world to urge them to condemn the Iranian Government for its repressive practices. The overwhelming positive responses we have received from those parliamentarians demonstrate the concern about the rights of the Baha'is transcend languages, cultures and borders.

We, Mr. Speaker, each of us, must tell the world of the official planned, premeditated oppression which the Iranian Government inflicts upon its own people, particularly upon the Baha'is. Iran must continue to be ostracized from the community of nations until its conduct can begin to approach a respect for the basic rights of each human being to live, worship, and speak according to the dictates of his or her own conscience.

With the passage of this resolution today, Congress will once again go on record in support of the basic rights of the Baha'i people and other religious minorities in Iran. I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his eloquent remarks. He has been a longstanding fighter for human rights throughout his career, and particularly as cochairman of the Human Rights Caucus.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLER of California). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GEJDENSON], that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 31.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule I, and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until Tuesday, April 19, 1994.

□ 1840

SPECIAL ORDERS

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of February 11, 1994, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

TWO SUBJECTS OF UPCOMING DEBATE

HEALTH CARE REFORM

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, what I wanted to talk about are two of the subjects that we will be debating in the course of this spring. The first one, of course, is health care reform; the second one, gun control.

I wanted to talk first about health care and specifically about an article I

read and, unfortunately, I am not exactly sure which publication it was in, but I believe it was the New York Times. It was about the Columbia Health Corp., which is the largest hospital company in the United States, has a net worth of about $267 million, and has a game plan to double in size over the next 5 years.

Currently, Columbia Health Corp., owns 195 hospitals across the country, and that is up from about 22 when the company was founded in 1988. They have all kinds of plans to grow. But the question about how they are going to grow, I think, is interesting and something that probably we should consider as we debate health care. And that is that what they plan to do is, because of the volume, get discounts from the suppliers when they buy things and have lower overhead and use this to basically negotiate better provider contracts.

Now, as we all know, health care is shifting from a cost-plus based reimbursement system. The way the cost-plus arrangement traditionally was is that the more services a doctor or a hospital performed, the more they got paid for it. So if you went in for a broken arm and they could x ray it three different ways, put on two different kinds of bandages, maybe test your blood, each procedure you got billed for.

And Medicare has changed that because of a lot of their reimbursements. But now managed health care is changing that as well. A long of insurance plans, HMO's and PPO's, are doing the same sort of thing.

So now we are seeing hospital and provider groups seeing how they can cut some of the expenses out. One example that this article showed that Columbia was using is, instead of testing a patient's blood after and operation, the blood gases, every 15 minutes, what would happen if you let it go for 30 or maybe 20 minutes. They were not saying there was an absolute but just stretching it out a little bit more.

There was a savings there, and there is a savings to be realized.

Obviously, early release of patients is going to save a lot of money, and they encourage their doctors in their provider networks to get folks out of the hospitals a lot faster. So that is another method that they are using.

Then one that I thought was real interesting, when you look at the economies of scale, and I thought this was particularly interesting because one of the proposals that we are talking about is allowing the formation of purchasing groups. And we are debating if that should be voluntary or mandatory. But in any case, listen to this.

Prior to Columbia's merge with the Hospital Corporation of America, they were purchasing a volume of x-ray film. That level now is about $30 million worth of x ray film each year. As a result of such a volume, they actually pay 40 percent less now than they did prior to the merger with HCA. I thought that was very indicative of what we are looking at in terms of potential health care savings, because $30 million by one corporation which, incidentally, only owns 3 percent of the for-profit hospitals in America, which for-profit hospitals, I believe, only constitute about 13 to 14 percent of the total hospital marketplace, the total delivery system for health care. So that shows what a relatively small player can do. Think what we can do as we merge together.

Another thing that they are practicing is somewhat controversial, and that is the cookbook type medicine where computer programs are getting doctors, nurses, and everyone else along the provider line to go and prescribe certain after-treatment therapy or certain treatment, depending on the ailment, by a computer program rather than "It is all in my head and I know what to do next." That structured application of medicine sometimes is called a cookbook form. I do not think that is always the case. Sometimes that is a good description, but it is not necessarily a derogatory term.

I think that is interesting. But to give you an idea what all this has meant to Columbia is that last year for the county contract in Lee County, FL, for the county employees, they underbid their closest competitors 38 to 58 percent providing health care services. I think there is a lesson out there, Mr. Speaker. I think this says something about the volume argument, something about purchasing groups, something that I would hope would be voluntary purchasing groups.

But it also shows you that reform is happening right now in the private sector. As I talked to hospitals and physicians around the country, I always ask, are you doing things differently this year than you did last year or 2 years ago. Every time the answer is yes. And if you say 5 years ago, you are talking ancient history.

So I think that the lesson of Columbia Health Corp. is that reform is going on. It is going on in the private sector right now. The sabre rattling by the administration and by Congress is very helpful in this. It is a catalyst to the private initiatives.

What I would hate to see us do in Congress is come in with a cookie-cutter approach on health care reform which would stifle initiatives. Certainly, Columbia is going to have its detractors, as does anyone else. But there are some positive things that are going on. I wanted to bring that to the attention of the Members here.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. Speaker, rather than continue talking about health care, I want to talk about gun control. I do not want to talk about all of gun control, because there are so many different aspects. And there is so much emotion. But I think because there is emotion, it is important for Members of Congress to look at gun control not based on philosophical bias but based on empirical data and objectivity.

Yet, I realize this is one of those issues that whenever you talk about it, you will have people already bristling, Where is he going with this?

Here is where I am going. I am going to talk about an article that was in the March Journal of Medicine, which is the publication of the Georgia Association of Medicine. In it they took to task some of the articles that have been printed by the CDC and the New England Journal of Medicine. They have done a good job, because they have referenced everything that they have put in there. They back it up.

The article that I am going to talk about was written by a lawyer named David B. Kopel. I hope I pronounced it correctly.

The name of the article is, "The Lure Of Foreign Gun laws."

□ 1850

In it he talks about countries that have strict gun control laws and what it has meant in terms of the crime rate. The first example he uses is in Japan.

In Japan, and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, anyone who wants a copy of this, please call my office, because I will be happy to share it. This magazine has more objective data on gun control than any publication I have seen.

It talks about Japan. Japan has strict gun control laws which actually go back to 1588, when the Emperor put a nationwide ban of swords and went through the samurai and the shoguns, I guess, and basically disarmed the peasants, and went up from the aristocracy from there. Today you cannot own a gun or a rifle in Japan. You can own a shotgun, only through very rigorous licensing laws.

Is it a safe country? It certainly is a safe country. They have a very low crime rate. What does that mean? Maybe if we look at it at first glance, get rid of the guns and you get rid of the crime problem, if you only look at the law and the crime rate.

Let us look at Switzerland, as Mr. Kopel did. In Switzerland, it actually has a lower murder rate than Japan. They have strict gun control laws, but in a completely different way. Every male in Switzerland has to join the militia. If you are between the age of 20 and 50 and you are male, you are a member of the militia. You spend 3 or 4 weeks per year training, and as part of your duty in the militia you are given a fully automatic assault rifle which you take home. You do not leave that at the National Guard armory for weekend duties. You do not pick it up

for your 3 weeks of summer training. You take that home to suburban Zurich or wherever you live, and you keep it at home. Every male must be proficient in marksmanship. Every male between the ages of 20 and 50 will get tested on marksmanship.

In a country which is about two-thirds the size of West Virginia, there are over 3,000 shooting ranges. Ammunition, while we have one proposal right now to tax it, is subsidized in Switzerland. To get a handgun or rifle there is a very easy permitting process. Just about any adult can get one. You can even get an antitank gun, antiaircraft gun, and you can buy some types of cannons. This is just the folks on the street.

I said earlier, Switzerland has a lower murder rate than Japan, which has a lot smaller murder rate than America. Are the Swiss just great people? Are they more responsible than Americans? Are they safer?

Are they smarter? What is it about them that is different than us?

I would submit that they are not more responsible, they are not safer, and they are not smarter, but what they do have in Switzerland, and they also have in Japan, is a strong family structure, tightly knit communities, and good relationships from generation to generation.

In short, in these two countries culturally young people are socialized into noncriminal behavior. That is so important, because as we look at the murder rates in America, and we have some of the diagrams and graphs in here, and I do not know that we will have time to get into them, but it does show that the homicide rates in America, the correlation is that it is still going up in the inner city, where you do not have the strong family structure and the tightly knit communities, and that is such an integral part of crime control and criminal justice reform that we as a Congress would be negligent if we do not put these folks into it.

If we just superficially kid ourselves and say we are going to get rid of the guns, we are going to get rid of the problems, the statistics do not show that at all. They show it to be a cultural socializing process which we are not doing a good job at in America, particularly in the inner cities, where we have the highest murder rates.

In Britain, they have very tough gun control laws. They have had those, I think, for about 30 or 40 years right now. Mr. Koppel says yet, despite that, in a country where only 4 percent of the households legally have guns, their murder rates are higher now than they were before the strict gun control laws went into effect.

Let us talk about Jamaica, because one of the things we hear so often from second amendment proponents is that you are not necessarily owning a gun to defend yourself against a burglar, but you are doing it to defend yourselves against the government.

In 1974 Jamaica enacted very strict gun control laws, which include house-to-house searches randomly, secret trials, detention incommunicado, mandatory life sentences for possession of a single bullet, very strict gun control laws.

What happened? Violent crime dropped significantly for about 6 months, but then, within a year, it went back up to the level it was before the gun control laws, and in fact has been increasing since.

What is the most significant is that one-third of the murders in Jamaica were perpetrated by the police. Think about that in terms of the second amendment people who are saying, "You have to worry about the government, not just the burglar," because what human rights groups are saying is that the police, what they would do is shoot their enemies, because their enemies were not armed, and then they would later go back and report that the citizen, the private citizen, had started it, and that he was killed in a shoot-out and the police shot him in self-defense. Of course, there were no witnesses.

Could government potentially be the enemy? Ask one-third of the people murdered in Jamaica and they would tell you absolutely yes, if they were around to say so, but they are not.

Think about what we are saying, Mr. Speaker. Why is it that police can have guns but you and I and the average American citizen cannot? Are they going to be that much safer, allowing police to have them and disarming ourselves? I do not think that is the case.

I trust my fellow Americans, as I know you do and most Members of Congress do, but I trust them to use their judgment.

This article, as I said, I can give any Member of Congress or anyone else a copy, but the publication itself is so full of statistics and facts and nonemotional discussion of the gun control issue that I think it ought to be required reading, particularly as we go into this debate.

Is this by a group that is an NRA-backed group? Certainly not. This group, if anything, is a more progun control group, but they have come to the conclusion that you cannot argue with the fact that the statistics do not merit outlawing guns. You are not going to get the achieved results. What you will do is have an argument that takes the emphasis off using the death penalty, off mandatory sentencing, off truth in sentencing, and so forth, but that is where we need to change. We do not need to take the guns.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to conclude with that for the time being. I look forward to discussing this magazine with Members of the House. I look forward to citing some of the graphs that are in here. There is just tons of good information. I appreciate the opportunity to address the House tonight.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ENGLISH of Arizona (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of family illness.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for April 18 and 19, on account of family illness.

Mr. NADLER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. CLEMENT (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. GUNDERSON (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of illness in the family.

Mr. FISH (at the request of Mr. MICHEL) for today, on account of recuperating from recent surgery.

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 Member (at the request of Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, for 5 minutes, on April 21.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. LANTOS) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. UNSOELD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. PORTER) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GOSS, for 5 minutes, on April 26.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GALLEGLY.

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

Mr. WALSH.

Mr. SOLOMON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. LANTOS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. TOWNS.

Mr. PASTOR.

Mr. DOOLEY.

Mr. STARK in two instances.

Mr. ACKERMAN in three instances.

Mr. SWETT.

Mr. HOYER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PORTER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GOODLING.
Mr. QUINN.
Mr. SHAW.
Mr. DORNAN.
Mrs. ROUKEMA.
Mr. BEREUTER in two instances.
Mr. GILMAN in two instances.

(The following Members (at the request of Ms. CANTWELL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.
Mr. RICHARDSON.
Mr. DURBIN in two instances.
Mr. LAROCCO.
Mr. FOGLIETTA.
Mrs. THRUMAN.
Mrs. MEEK of Florida.
Mrs. SCHROEDER.
Mr. ORTIZ.
Mr. MORAN.
Mr. QUINN.
Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.
Mr. REED in two instances.
Mr. GEJDENSON.
Mr. STARK in two instances.
Mrs. UNSOELD.
Mr. SABO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 58 minutes p.m.) under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, April 19, 1994, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2966. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his request to make available appropriations totaling $329 million in budget authority for the Departments of Commerce, Housing and Urban Development, the Interior, the GSA, NASA, the SBA, and the Legal Services Corporation, and to designate these amounts as emergency requirements pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D)(i) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107 (H. Doc. No. 103-238); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2967. A letter from the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals of budget authority as of April 1, 1994, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e) (H. Doc. No. 103-239); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

2968. A letter from the Director of Legislation, Department of the Navy, transmitting notice that the Navy intends to renew the lease of vessels to the Government of Brazil, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2969. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a report on the administration of the Manufactured Home Construction and Safety Standards Program for the years 1988-90, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 5425; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2970. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting proposed transactions of $100 million or more involving United States exports to Italy, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2971. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's 80th annual operation report during calendar year 1993, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 247; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2972. A letter from the Deputy and Acting CEO, Resolution Trust Corporation, transmitting the semiannual report on the Affordable Housing Disposition Program which covers the reporting period defined as July 1, 1993, through December 31, 1993, pursuant to Public Law 102-233, section 616 (105 Stat. 1787); to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2973. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting notification of the implementation of certain regulations; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

2974. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting a copy of Final regulations—Federal Family Education Loan Program, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2975. A letter from the Secretary of Education, transmitting Notice—Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins Loan, Federal Work-Study, Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, Federal Family Education Loan, Federal Direct Student Loan, and Federal Pell Grant Programs, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(d)(1); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2976. A letter from the Department of Energy, transmitting meeting notice of the Industry Advisory Board of the International Energy Agency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2977. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report on hydroelectric licensing in the State of Hawaii, pursuant to Public Law 102-486, section 2408; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2978. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles, to Brazil (Transmittal No. 14-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2979. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Brazil (Transmittal No. 13-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2980. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Air Force's proposed lease of defense articles to the Netherlands (Transmittal No. 12-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2981. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Brazil (Transmittal No. 15-94), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2982. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the price and availability report for the quarter ending March 31, 1994, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2768; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2983. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of original reports of political contributions by nominees, Ambassadors-designate and members of their families, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2984. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Robert Krueger, of Texas, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Burundi, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944(b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2985. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of State for Legislative Affairs, transmitting copies of the original report of political contributions by Irvin Hicks, of Maryland, Ambassador-designate to Ethiopia, and members of his family, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3944 (b)(2); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2986. A letter from the Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the annual report under the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act for fiscal year 1993, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2987. A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2988. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1993, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Operations.

2989. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the 13th annual report on the progress that has been made on oil and gas leasing, exploration, and development activities on Federal lands in Alaska, other than on the North Slope or the National Petroleum Reserve during fiscal year 1993, pursuant to Public Law 96-487, section 1008(b)(4); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2990. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting a study of State and Federal regulations governing the movement of water well drilling rigs on public highways, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 5004(b) (105 Stat. 2160); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2991. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of building project surveys for London, KY, and Covington, KY, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2992. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report of the National Scenic Byways Advisory Committee concerning the Committee's recommendations on establishment of a National Scenic Byways program, pursuant to Public Law 102-240, section 1047(a)(4); to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

2993. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report as of the end of the fiscal year 1993 on the effectiveness and costs of carrying out the Department of Defense Civilian Separation Pay Program; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Post Office and Civil Service.

2994. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote entre-

preneurial management of the National Park Service, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Natural Resources and the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HAMILTON: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 3813. A bill to amend the Export Enhancement Act of 1988 to promote further U.S. exports of environmental technologies, goods, and services; with an amendment (Rept. 103-478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ORTIZ (for himself, Mr. WELDON, Mr. FIELDS of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. ANDREWS of Texas, Mr. WASHINGTON, Mr. ROSE, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 4236. A bill to establish a National Undersea Research Program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DURBIN:

H.R. 4237. A bill to prohibit the possession in a public housing zone of a firearm the possession of which is otherwise unlawful, and to prohibit the discharge of a firearm in a public housing zone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLAKE (for himself, Mr. JOHNSTON of Florida, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. BLACKWELL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RUSH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. CLAY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. OWENS, Mr. WATT, Ms. COLLINS of Michigan, Mr. TUCKER, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. STOKES, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. MFUME):

H.R. 4238. A bill to authorize supplemental appropriations for fiscal years 1994 and 1995 for relief, rehabilitation, and reconstruction in Liberia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself and Mr. ROTH):

H.R. 4239. A bill to provide for the establishment of a foreign assistance program to support efforts by other countries to protect intellectual property; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MACHTLEY:

H.R. 4240. A bill to ensure that defense conversion, reinvestment, and transition assistance programs of the Department of Defense are directed primarily toward those States, and areas within those States, that have experienced the greatest number of job losses as a result of reductions in defense spending or the closure or realignment of military installations; jointly, to the Committees on Education and Labor and Armed Services.

By Mrs. SCHROEDER:

H.R. 4241. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require the use of standardized claim forms under the health benefits program for Federal employees, and to amend title 10, United States Code, to require the use of such forms in the Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services; jointly, to the Committees on Armed Services and Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. BLILEY):

H.R. 4242. A bill to enforce the law regulating the height of buildings in the District of Columbia by prohibiting the District of Columbia from issuing any building or occupancy permit for the project described in Zoning Commission case 93-9C unless the project is modified to conform to such law; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 4243. A bill to confirm limitations on the height of buildings and roof structures in the District of Columbia, to expand the authority of the National Capital Planning Commission to enforce such limitations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. UNSOELD (for herself and Mr. STUDDS):

H.R. 4244. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide equitable treatment for certain individuals employed on vessels with respect to State and local income taxes; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES:

H.J. Res. 355. Joint resolutiong designating 1995 as the "Year of the Grandparent"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RICHARDSON (for himself, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DE LUGO, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. TORRES, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. BECERRA):

H.J. Res. 356. Joint resolution designating March 31, 1995, as "Cesar E. Chavez Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. GEJDENSON (for himself and Mr. ROTH):

H. Con. Res. 240. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to intellectual property protection; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself, Mr. BONILLA, and Mr. SANGMEISTER):

H. Res. 406. Resolution providing for the concurrency by the House with amendments in amendment of the Senate to H.R. 821; considered under the suspension of the rules and agreed to.

By Mr. ZELIFF (for himself and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey):

H. Res. 407. Resolution providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3266) to provide for automatic downward adjustments in the discretionary spending limits for fiscal year 1994 set forth in the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 equal to the amount of rescissions contained in this act; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

333. The SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the tenth amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

334. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to safe drinking water; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

335. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to all waters of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

336. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to the desecration of the American flag; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

337. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to motorcycle helmets in Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

338. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maine, relative to the national highway system; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

339. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

340. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to the public assistance programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

341. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, relative to grain producers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

342. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the Oil Pollution Act of 1990; jointly, to the Committees on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and Public Works and Transportation.

343. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, relative to the New Jersey urban core project; jointly, to the Committees on Public Works and Transportation and Energy and Commerce.

344. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, relative to the export of Alaska North Slope crude oil; jointly, to the Committees on Foreign Affairs, Energy and Commerce, and Natural Resources.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 429: Mr. WELDON.

H.R. 512: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. PELOSI, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 566: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 790: Ms. ESHOO and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 1106: Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MANTON, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. VENTO.

H.R. 1295: Mr. LAROCCO.

H.R. 1596: Mrs. BENTLEY.

H.R. 1620: Mr. RAVENEL.

H.R. 1627: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1671: Mr. BLILEY and Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 1687: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 1712: Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota.

H.R. 1840: Mr. HASTERT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 1900: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 1906: Mr. VENTO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 1957: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 2175: Mr. SLATTERY.

H.R. 2433: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 2467: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. COX, Mr. HERGER, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. KLEIN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2572: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 2710: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey, Mr. HAMBURG, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WYNN, and Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 2839: Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 2898: Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 2930: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. FURSE, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3005: Mr. KYL.

H.R. 3023: Mr. FARR, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. SARPALIUS.

H.R. 3039: Mr. MORAN and Mr. LIVINGSTON.

H.R. 3109: Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 3261: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 3278: Mr. TORRES.

H.R. 3288: Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 3407: Mr. DARDEN, Mr. SHAW, Mr. COMBEST, Ms. DANNER, Mr. BLILEY, and Mr. LEWIS of Florida.

H.R. 3421: Mrs. VUCANOVICH, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, and Mr. GLICKMAN.

H.R. 3424: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 3656: Mr. OWENS, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. SHEPHERD, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 3695: Mr. HOKE and Mr. DELAY.

H.R. 3705: Mr. SHAYS and Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 3744: Mr. KING.

H.R. 3785: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. FROST, Mr. HUGHES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ORTON, Mr. PARKER, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 3790: Mr. MYERS of Indiana.

H.R. 3820: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. TEJEDA, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WILSON, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. TORKILDSEN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. LAUGHLIN, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. FISH, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. DREIER, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas.

H.R. 3835: Mr. COPPERSMITH, Ms. SCHENK, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. KIM.

H.R. 3870: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3901: Mr. WATT, Mr. BLACKWELL, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MFUME, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. WATERS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. DELLUMS.

H.R. 3902: Mr. UPTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 3951: Mr. STEARNS.

H.R. 3992: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 3994: Mr. ANDREWS of New Jersey.

H.R. 4028: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 4050: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 4056: Mr. COYNE, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. THOMAS of California, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LEVY, Mr. MCHUGH, and Mr. SUNDQUIST.

H.R. 4178: Mr. HERGER.

H.J. Res. 145: Mr. ZIMMER, Mr. EWING, Mr. BACHUS of Alabama, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.J. Res. 209: Mr. SARPALIUS, Mr. SUNDQUIST, and Mr. EDWARDS of Texas.

H.J. Res. 302: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. LAROCCO, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. WYNN, Mr. PETE GEREN of Texas, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.J. Res. 303: Mr. WALSH, Mr. EDWARDS of Texas, Mr. KREIDLER, Mr. LIVINGSTON, Mr. SHAW, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. KIM, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.J. Res. 304: Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MACHTLEY, Mr. MANTON, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FAZIO, and Mr. TANNER.

H.J. Res. 332: Mr. VENTO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. FROST, and Mr. EVANS.

H. Con. Res. 124: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. CRAMER.

H. Con. Res. 148: Mr. MANTON, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 212: Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. EDWARDS of California, Mr. FARR, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. KOPETSKI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MAZZOLI, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. PENNY, Mr. PARKER, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. REED, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. SCHROEDER, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mrs. UNSOELD.

H. Con. Res. 227: Mr. HANCOCK.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

87. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Township of Denville, NJ, relative to military funds; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

88. Also, petition of the city of Cincinnati, city hall, Cincinnati, OH, relative to expenses of SORTA; to the Committee on Public Works and Transportation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

HOW SCHOOL CHOICE IMPROVES PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. ROBERT K. DORNAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. DORNAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the attention of my colleagues an editorial about school choice and how it would improve the disastrous state of our public school system.

The article follows:

HOW SCHOOL CHOICE IMPROVES PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Robert J. Barro)

School-choice programs that include private schools are a promising way to deliver improved education, especially for children from poor families. Experiments such as Milwaukee's have shown some success, but systems that include any funding for private schools are rare. Not coincidentally, in 1990 only 12% of elementary and secondary students attended private schools, with only 12% of the private enrollment in nonsectarian institutions (8% at the primary level and 14% at the secondary level). Catholic schools were the dominant private provider, with about 70% of overall private enrollment.

The overwhelming choice of public over private education does not, of course, mean that most people view public schooling as superior. Various studies, notably those by sociologist James Coleman and his associates, have found that students with a given level of native ability do better when they attend private institutions, especially Catholic schools in inner cities.

What sustains the dominance of public schools is that individual consumers regard the public option as free and the private one as expensive. Catholic schools are able to thrive in spite of this obstacle because church subsidies maintain low levels of tuition.

Nonsectarian schools—including elite places such as Andover and St. Paul's—typically have to rely on high levels to tuition and limited amount of financial aid and therefore can serve only a small, privileged market.

The central element of school-choice plans is the use of vouchers or tax credits to level the playing field between public and private schools. Vouchers would increase the demand for private education and, hence, improve the average performance of graduate. The most dramatic change would be predicted for poor families, who now typically lack access to private schools or high-quality public schools.

A substantial part of the opposition to school-choice plans comes from two groups: well-off suburbanites and public-school employees. Suburbanites are usually at least somewhat satisfied with their local public schools and do not wish to pay higher taxes to give money to people who already use private schools. Public-school employees do not want to lose an entrenched position that ensures a reasonable income even when their performance is bad. For these opposition groups, a key concern is how a school-choice plan and the consequent expansion of private alternatives would affect the public schools. Would the quality and levels of funding diminish, or would the increased competition force the public schools to do better?

Recent research by Caroline Minter-Hoxby in her doctoral dissertation at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology ("Do Private Schools Provide Competition for Public Schools?") offers evidence on this issue. The main information in her study comes from the interaction between an area's use of private schools—especially Catholic schools—and the quality of public education. The information in these data is better than that provided by existing school-choice programs because in the latter case it is hard to discern long-run responses to experiments (such as the one in Milwaukee) that are relatively new and perceived as temporary. Moreover, existing school-choice plans tend to contain serious restrictions on the options of schools and students.

The key challenge is to isolate the effect of greater availability of private schools on the performance of the public schools. This work is a challenge because the simple relation between an area's private-school use and the quality of the public schools could, in theory, be positive or negative.

First, if an area's public schools are performing badly, then more families would be motivated to use private schools. This response tends to generate a negative relation between public-school quality and private-school use. Second, if an area's families are wealthier and better educated, then private-school use and public-school quality are both likely to be higher. This interaction tends to generate a positive relation between public-school quality and private-school use. Finally, if an increased availability of private schools provides competition that motivates the public schools to perform more efficiently, this creates a positive relationship. It is this relation that we would like to measure if it exists.

The Minter-Hoxby study shows how cross-county differences in the costs of providing private education affect the quality of public schools. In practice, the U.S. experience dictates a reliance on information about sectarian private schooling. The cost difference for operating these sectarian schools come from variations across counties, in the population density of Catholics or of other religious denominations that run significant numbers of private schools.

The key conclusion is that greater use of private schools, driven by differences in costs, leads to improved performance by public-school students and to greater per-pupil spending in the public schools. These results remain true after adjusting for an array of individual and county differences, including levels of income and parental education and a person's religion and race.

One finding is that an increase of 10 percentage points in the share of a county's enrollment in private secondary schools adds 0.3 years to the highest grade completed by the average public-school student by age 24. This increase in the share of private enrollment is also estimated to raise a public-school student's probability of receiving a high-school diploma by age 19 by 2% and to increase the wage earned by the average public-school student at age 24 by 5% partly because the student is more likely to move to a more prosperous area and partly because the student's position in the earnings distribution improves). Thus the presence of private alternatives means that the students who remain in the public schools achieve at higher levels.

The data also show that governments respond to greater competition from private schools by raising teachers' salaries and overall spending per student in the public schools. An increase by 10 percentage points in the share of a county's enrollment in private secondary schools is estimated to raise the starting salary for a teacher with a B.A. by $160 in public secondary schools and to raise per pupil spending in these schools by $340 (all measured in 1980 dollars). Hence, at least the public-school teachers who retain their positions—presumably the most qualified ought to be happy when private schools become more available.

If we combine the Minter-Hoxby evidence with previous results on the performance of private schools, then the inference is that full school choice programs would improve student achievement whether the students shift to private schools or stay in the public system. In other words, school choice is a good idea.

HONORING PETER HEANEY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my constituents of the Fifth Congressional District in recognizing Peter Heaney, a businessman selflessly dedicated to the improvement of the less fortunate and the continued growth of the community.

A native of Massachusetts, Peter moved to New York in 1951 and attended local schools. Attracted to St. John's University, he excelled in its management and marketing program and was graduated in 1964.

Through innovative telemarketing and a keen sense of business development, Mr. Heaney now heads Skaggs-Walsh Inc., a company providing heating oil to over 9,000 customers throughout New York City and Nassau County. He has headed this firm for over 30 years and has consistently demonstrated a commitment to energy conservation.

Peter Heaney's expertise as a business leader extends well beyond his own company. Recognizing his expertise and willingness to share his broad experience, his colleagues have appointed him to such leadership positions as director of the New York Oil Heating Association, a trustee of the Oil Heating Insurance Fund, and president of the Empire State

Petroleum Association. In addition, he is former director of the College Point Board of Trade and a sponsor of the Queens Half Marathon.

Peter constantly utilizes his business and organizational expertise to enhance civic and philanthropic associations. His efforts on behalf of the Queens Chamber of Commerce, the American Cancer Society, the Cardinal's Committee of the Laity, the Family Services Association, Phillips Exeter Academy, Georgetown, Yale, St. John's Universities, and the North Shore University Hospital have served to enhance the efforts of these groups in supporting the general community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join with me today in honoring a fine philanthropist and entrepreneur, Peter Heany. His is a most truly talented and compassionate individual who constantly has given of himself for the enhancement of others.

IN HONOR OF MARIE MARTIN

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a few minutes to recognize Marie Martin's distinguished career of service to the schools and community of Fremont, CA.

For more than 23 years, Marie Martin has committed herself to service in the field of education. Beginning in 1973, Mrs. Martin taught grades K–6 for over a decade. From 1983 to 1985, she served as a reading specialist, before becoming a staff development trainer in the Fremont Unified School District. In July 1986, Mrs. Martin became the principal of the Chadbourne School in Fremont, where she has served faithfully for the last 8 years.

Mrs. Martin has previously served as a trainer in the mentor teacher program of the Fremont Unified School District. She also has been a member of the National Education Association and the American Association of University Women. Currently, Mrs. Martin is a member of Partners in Education, the Alameda County Staff Development Network, and is serving as a trainer in the school improvement program of lead and non-lead program reviewers.

On May 20, 1994 Marie Martin's colleagues and friends will hold a retirement celebration to acknowledge her as an outstanding educator and principal. I would like to join with those who have recognized her for her excellent achievements.

Marie Martin will be sorely missed at the Fremont Unified School District. I wish her much happiness and success in all of her future endeavors.

NATIONAL UNDERSEA RESEARCH PROGRAM

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation to establish the National Undersea Research Program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

The National Undersea Research Program [NURP] has been in existence since 1980 and is the Nation's sole civilian agency whose primary mission is to provide researchers access to advanced undersea technologies to conduct marine research. The objective of NURP is to provide an integrated program focusing on research relating to processes in the oceans and Great Lakes in order to better understand the global marine ecosystem. This mission is carried out by a network of National Undersea Research Centers which fund and conduct scientific research through a competitive, merit review grant process. The Centers provide underwater research systems including shallow and deep diving submersibles, remotely operated vehicles, and specialized SCUBA systems through a combination of leased and in-house capabilities. In addition, the Centers provide technical expertise in the operation of these systems. This allows scientists access to the newest undersea technologies and methods, as well as guidance in the application of these tools to complex research projects.

The bill I introduce today is very similar to H.R. 3247, which was introduced and passed by the House last Congress. The bill directs the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere to establish and maintain an Office of Undersea Research within the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA] to contain the National Undersea Research Program. The bill directs the Under Secretary to appoint a Program Director to oversee the Office of Undersea Research and to administer NURP. The Under Secretary is also directed to establish an independent steering committee to advise the Under Secretary and the Program Director concerning the operation of NURP, the need to revise the priority research areas, and the designation and operation of the National Undersea Research Centers. The bill sets out procedures for the establishment of undersea research regions and Centers, as well as for reviewing and funding research within the Centers. In addition, the legislation establishes a new undersea research center for the Gulf of Mexico region.

Authorization for funding the NURP regional Centers is set at $20,000,000 for fiscal year 1995, increasing by $2,000,000 per year until fiscal year 1999. A separate authorization of $2,100,000 for fiscal year 1995 (increasing by $100,000 through fiscal year 1999) is provided for management, administration and support the ALVIN undersea research submersible.

Mr. Speaker, this program has been a proven leader in the oceanographic research community for many years. This authorization will legislatively establish the program with many of the existing operational processes, and additionally, provide needed guidance through a high level steering committee. I urge you and the other members of the House to support this initiative.

GUN-FREE PUBLIC HOUSING ZONES ACT OF 1994

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that is designed to help reduce the terror of gunfire in our country's public housing facilities. I am proposing that the Federal Government lend a helping hand to housing authorities which are struggling to cope with the violent crime plaguing their communities. Today, I am introducing the Gun-Free Public Housing Zones Act of 1994.

The proliferation of violence, including the scourge of gun violence, in public housing is well documented from Los Angeles to Chicago to New York City. In some local housing authority facilities, violent incidents are two to six times greater than the local average. For example, in Los Angeles between 1986 and 1989, reported violent crime, including firearm violations, occurred at an average annual rate of 67 per 1,000 people in public housing developments, compared to 22 per 1,000 citywide.

Weapons seizures in public housing facilities have increased dramatically since 1990 in Chicago. Last year alone, housing authority and Chicago police confiscated over 1100 firearms from inside Chicago housing projects, a 22 percent increase from the nearly 900 seizures in 1990. Equally as disturbing are some recent statistics on the incidence of gun shots. Authorities estimate that during one weekend late last month, there were over 300 reports of shots fire at one Chicago Housing Authority property, the Robert Taylor Homes.

Last year, the New York City Housing Authority Police Department listed 1063 firearms seized and over 1,500 reports of gunfire in public housing facilities. The housing authority also reported 135 gun-related deaths.

Across America, weapons and gunfire are quickly becoming commonplace in public housing facilities. Children are afraid to play outside or even walk to school. Parents risk their lives everytime they walk to the bus stop or make a trip to the grocery store. These conditions are very real for public housing residents in Chicago and around the country.

And it is not just an urban problem—smaller communities are also suffering the horrors of gun violence in public housing. My home town of Springfield, IL, has seen a rash of violence and gunfire in the Evergreen Terrace housing project and other facilities around the city. In Marion County, IL, gun shots frequently ring out from public housing units.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has responded to the proliferation of gun violence by initiating Operation Safe Home. Many local public housing authorities have also responded by initiating sweeping measures to rid the projects of weapons. I be-

lieve it is time for Congress to step up and assume some of the responsibility for addressing this deadly issue.

My legislation, the Gun-Free Public Housing Zones Act of 1994, would prohibit the possession of an illegal firearm on public housing property, punishable by up to 5 years in prison, a $5,000 fine, or both. It would also prohibit, with certain exceptions, the reckless discharge or attempted discharge of any firearm on public housing property.

The Federal Government has a responsibility for the protection and well-being of society's most vulnerable citizens. In the past several years, Congress has recognized this responsibility by consistently passing legislation that prohibits the possession of any guns in special school zones.

This legislation does not prohibit all guns from public housing zones. However, it does recognize the special vulnerability of public housing residents by increasing the punishment for those caught with illegal weapons there. Currently, the penalty for being caught with an illegal weapon on public housing property is not an overwhelming concern of lawbreakers. If this measure is enacted, it certainly will be.

Mr. Speaker, our response to the ever-growing nightmare of gun violence in public housing facilities must be comprehensive and decisive. I believe this legislation is an important step in the right direction.

SALUTE TO THE SULTAN JIHAD AHMAD SCHOLARSHIP

HON. THOMAS M. FOGLIETTA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. FOGLIETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to inform my colleagues of the Sultan Jihad Ahmad Scholarship Fund Dinner Dance to be held this Wednesday, April 20. Two years ago, Sultan Jihad was tragically killed, a victim of senseless violent crime. Sultan Ahmad, his father and executive director of the Mayor's office of community services in Philadelphia, has put together this annual event as a tribute to his son and as a message that we must focus our attention and energies on our youth so that they grow up with real opportunities.

Sultan Ahmad was a guest at a White House crime briefing back in February, and took the opportunity to remind Vice President GORE and others present at the meeting that crime is something that must be stopped through the presentation of opportunities to our youth rather than the implementation of penalties after a life of crime has begun. Sultan explained at the White House that we are only fooling ourselves with tough rhetoric about crime, and that the only way to truly change the violent nature of our society is to fundamentally alter the atmosphere in which our children grow up. To quote Sultan:

> We won't have to mourn the loss of kids to drugs if we go beyond the slogans and instead, commit genuine resources to ending the demand for drugs on the street. We won't suffer the agony of losing our kids to violence if we spend real dollars to make our schools a place where kids want to learn and are safe to attend.

We must take Sultan's words to heart. Everyday our children are further corrupted by the evil side of society, while being presented with very few positive opportunities for growth and learning. Sultan Ahmad is following his own words by honoring the memory of his lost son with a memorial scholarship. As the House of Representatives considers anticrime legislation this week, we, as Members of Congress, must also learn from Sultan's example by opening doors for our children and providing them with opportunities and resources instead of hollow rhetoric. I salute Sultan Ahmad and join him in honoring the memory of his son.

INTRODUCTION OF THE INSURANCE FORM SIMPLIFICATION ACT

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Insurance Form Simplification Act. This bill requires insurance claims under both the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program [FEHBP] and the Civilian Health And Medical Program of the Uniformed Services [CHAMPUS] to use a standard form.

In other words, it will standardize and simplify insurance claims for Federal employees and for military personnel.

This is an important first step in reforming health care. If we can't use one form for health care claims I don't know how we are going to eliminate waste.

There are nearly 15 million military and civilian employees, retirees, and family members who participate in these plans.

Since many of the health care proposals either exclude these programs or in some cases use them as a model, it is especially important that we take steps to reduce the cost of these plans.

If we can reduce paper work, we can save money. I hope my colleagues will join me in cosponsoring the Insurance Form Simplification Act.

TRIBUTE TO KINGS PARK CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT IN HONOR OF ITS 150TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to the Kings Park Central School District on its 150th anniversary.

The Kings Park School District is one of the oldest public school systems in the United States. On February 1, 1844, Kings Park held its first school board meeting. During these early years, like most school systems, it operated out of a one-room school house. By 1872, Kings Park had 34 students and the entire annual budget for teacher's wages was $292.

By the late 1800's, the community had grown due to the establishment of the Kings County Farm, today known as the Long Island State Hospital at Kings Park. A new one-room school house was built, which covered grades one to eight. One teacher taught all grade levels.

After the turn of the century, a new, two-story, four-room school house was built, and several teachers were now hired. However, students who wanted to go to high school had to attend nearby Smithtown or Northport High Schools. This changed in 1928 when a new school was built that included a high school. By now the student population had grown to 250.

Since the late 1920's the Kings Park School District has grown as the population of the community increased significantly. This continued until 1987 when the district went through a major reorganization. The district was scaled back to two elementary schools, a middle school for grades 5, 6, 7, and 8, and a high school. A new student population increase is now taking place and the district has reopened the Ralph Osgood Elementary School.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in paying tribute to District Superintendent Dr. Mary DeRose, School Board President Charles Gardner, and to all of the students, parents, teachers, administrators, and staff of the Kings Park School District as the district celebrates 150 years of quality education to our youth.

IN HONOR OF TONY NIEVES

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to take a few minutes to recognize Tony Nieves' distinguished career of service to the citizens of Fremont, CA.

For over 39 years, Mr. Nieves has dedicated himself to the safety and well-being of the students in the Fremont Unified School District. Hired in 1955, Mr. Nieves worked on the building maintenance staff, helping to ensure the smooth operation of the schools of Fremont. He later began specializing in carpentry and drafting, before becoming the coordinating assistant for facilities construction. In 1976, Mr. Nieves served as an administrative assistant in the management office. Currently, he is the director of facilities management, a position that he has held for the last 14 years.

Throughout his years of service, Mr. Nieves' goal has been to ensure that the district's school facilities would provide the safest and best possible learning environment for the students. His dedication to this goal has made him an integral part of the education of Fremont's youth.

On September 30, 1994, the friends and colleagues of Tony Nieves will be hosting a retirement party to honor his years of faithful

service to the Fremont Unified School District. I would like to join them in their commendation of his hard work and dedication.

MY COMMITMENT TO AMERICA

HON. H. MARTIN LANCASTER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to extend my congratulation to a young man, Matthew Kirby-Smith of Beaufort, NC, located in my congressional district, for being the overall winner for the State of North Carolina in the Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy scholarship program. Matthew submitted his essay through Jones-Austin VFW Post 2401 and Ladies Auxiliary.

This past year more than 138,000 students participated. The contest theme for this year was "My Commitment to America." Matthew is an active participant in school activities at East Carteret High School and in his community. I am proud to include this following essay in my remarks for the RECORD.

"MY COMMITMENT TO AMERICA"

(By Matthew Kirby-Smith, Post 2401, Beaufort, NC, 1993/94 VFW Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program North Carolina Winner)

"America is a country founded by the people, for the people." This statement is more than just a simple statement by our forefathers. It is the ideal that our country is founded on. The government is here by the people, for the people. Those peoples are us; you, me, and everyone else that lives here. In order for life to be what we want it—free, fair, and just—we must all realize our responsibilities to our ideal. America is not merely a free country of opportunity, it is a group of free people pursuing their happiness. To retain this privilege we must all contribute to the ideal. My responsibility to this country is what everyone's is: to fight for my country, me life; to help ensure good leadership, to vote; and to ensure the immortality of this country and her ideals, I must help others. The key to our lives in freedom is our stand together, as the people of the country, for this country.

To elaborate on these responsibilities is necessary to ensure true understanding of what I, along with my generation, must be ready, willing, and able to do.

One of the most obvious responsibilities I have is that of service. Service in the military, and the will to fight for what I believe our country should be; this is a responsibility handed down to me by countless other patriots who fought and died for this idea. This is a responsibility not to be taken lightly. From the War of 1812, in which 2,200 died, to WWII where 407,000 Americans died; it has always been a struggle for American freedom. To keep our way of life, we sometimes must fight. In order for the deaths of these patriots to mean something, we must be ready to uphold their efforts, even if it means fighting.

When I turn 18 I will receive a gift that was established early in American history (first for whites, then blacks and women), the right to vote. This right is truly a trademark of the American way. To choose the leaders of the government is unheard of in many countries. It will be my job to use this privilege correctly, and to help others to use theirs. Our country really depends on all of our contributions. We have the chance to choose who leads us. I am proud of this right! I choose who I follow. To a certain extent, I am the master of my fate. It makes me incredibly happy to know that no one is telling me what to do unless I choose him to do so. It should make you happy, too.

We truly do not realize what voting is. The power is in my hands. It is in our hands.

The right to vote and the willingness to fight are two important parts of our country and of my responsibilities. Perhaps an even more important responsibility of mine is to myself and others. Although voting is a direct way of making our will known, more important is our personal impact on each other. My major responsibility to our country's life is my influence on my peers. I am capable of influencing my generation. This responsibility becomes evident as we become older. We start to form parties and to lobby for different causes. If I can't be in the government, I can still help direct it by my vote, and by my actions on others. I can help to teach other people about their abilities; the ability to vote and to change things with letters to congressmen and to senators. The simple action of obeying laws, and just setting examples for others. These are two very subtle, but effective ways of helping our country.

To be ready to fight, to vote, to lead by example and influence—these are my responsibilities to America. These are mine and all of ours. This country will only survive if we want it to. We all influence its change and growth. It truly is a place in which I am very happy to be. It is up to me.

HONORING NORTH MIAMI BOY SCOUT TROOP 39

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, May 13, 1994, North Miami's Boy Scout Troop 39 will celebrate its 39th anniversary.

Founded in 1955, and originally meeting in the old north Miami firehouse, Troop 39 has been a guiding force behind generations of Scouts in the north Dade area. Presently under the leadership of Scoutmaster Joe Alterman, Troop 39 continues to serve the community in a variety of ways. They have sponsored a breakfast for local war veterans and coordinated an Easter egg hunt in a local park.

Troop 39's May 13 celebration will serve as a homecoming for past Scouts and leaders. As they gather on this important occasion, I want to join with our community in honoring the past and present members of Boy Scout Troop 39 and their sponsor, the North Miami Elks Lodge 1835. Their efforts on behalf of the community set a high standard of service. I know they will continue their outstanding work well into the next century.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD L. BROWN

HON. JAMES P. MORAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, on April 30 of this year, Mr. Donald L. Brown will conclude 10 years of service to Children's National Medical Center. As many of my colleagues know, Children's is a premier pediatric health care facility. Last year, more than 1,600 children were admitted to the trauma service at Children's National Medical Center, where they received immediate treatment for their injuries.

Mr. Brown began his association with Children's in 1984, when he joined the hospital as executive vice president and chief operating officer. In October 1986, he was named president and chief executive officer. Throughout his association with Children's National Medical Center, Don Brown has demonstrated exceptional leadership in guiding the growth and development of Children's National Medical Center to protect, preserve, and advance the unique medical needs of children in this region.

Under Mr. Brown's leadership, the hospital developed a 5-year strategic plan to guide the growth of the hospital's programs and services, including a corporate restructuring in 1989 that enabled the hospital to function more effectively and efficiently. In 1989, in anticipation of a changing market, Mr. Brown constituted a hospital task force to examine future challenges in pediatric health care and their potential impact on Children's National Medical Center. This group produced "Vision for the Year 2000" which outlined strategies to address such issues as increasing operating costs and decreasing reimbursements. The medical center has been employing those strategies effectively in recent years.

Under Don Brown's leadership, Children's National Medical Center expanded a number of its clinical activities in ways that greatly improved access to high quality pediatric health care for the children and families in northern Virginia. Children's National Medical Center built a helipad as part of their renowned trauma service so that children could arrive by helicopter as well as by ambulance. They also developed the national safe Kids campaign, which is a nationwide effort to reduce the number of childhood accidents. The Safe Kids campaign now has more than 160 State and local coalitions in 46 States, the District of Columbia, and Canada.

Another notable accomplishment was the expansion and enhancement of the main hospital facility. Under Don Brown's leadership, the hospital has grown facility. Under Don Brown's leadership, the hospital has grown by 175,000 square feet between 1986 and 1993. A long-range facilities plan was developed, and construction of new facilities for research and expanded ambulatory and emergency care areas undertaken. These physical changes to the infrastructure symbolize the commitment of Children's National Medical Center to the continued health and vitality of the children and families of this region.

Most notably, Children's has worked to enhance and expand services and access for the

children of northern Virginia. The Children's satellite center in Annandale, VA, is an important pediatric health care follow-up clinic and referral center for our families and our community's primary care physicians. The hospital is developing even stronger ties to children in northern Virginia by expanding its clinics. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, Children's National Medical Center is very important to me and to my constituents. I was pleased to participate in last year's Children's Miracle Network Telethon on behalf of the hospital. Our regional community raised a record breaking $2.2 million.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask my colleagues to join with me in saluting Don Brown for his accomplishments as president of Children's National Medical Center and his continued leadership on behalf of the special needs of children. Don Brown's vision and commitment have helped ensure that the children of northern Virginia and their families will be able to count on Children's National Medical Center and its unique brand of pediatric health care well into the next century.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN CULLEN AND BERNARD KENNEDY, RECIPIENTS OF THE 1994 LONG ISLAND ASSOCIATION MEDAL OF HONOR

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to John Cullen and Bernard Kennedy, who will be honored by the Long Island Association with its 1994 Medal of Honor.

The Long Island Association is the leading business and civic group for the Long Island region. It is also one of the largest business organizations in the country. The Medal of Honor is the association's highest award, and is presented once a year to individuals who distinguished themselves by significantly contributing to the lives of all of the residents of Long Island.

John Cullen is chairman and chief executive officer, and Bernard Kennedy is president and chief operating officer, of King Kullen Grocery Co., the Nation's oldest supermarket chain. The King Kullen Grocery Co., which was founded in 1930 by Michael J. Cullen, has been recognized by the Smithsonian Institute as America's first supermarket. The company is family-owned and operated, and currently employs 4,500 people at its 46 stores throughout Suffolk, Nassau, Queens, and Richmond Counties in New York.

In 1930, founder Michael Cullen leased a vacant garage in Jamaica, Queens, and started the first supermarket. Immediately he revolutionized the retail food industry by allowing customers for the first time to obtain all their groceries from one store. Consumers no longer had to visit separate shops to obtain all their provisions. John Cullen and Bernard Kennedy continue this tradition today. They have also been major supporters of a wide variety of not-for-profit organizations and charities. Various Long Island hospitals, the Little Flower Children's Services of New York and the Family Service League of Nassau and Suffolk Counties are among the many organizations King Kullen supports through the leadership of John Cullen and Bernard Kennedy.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all my colleagues in the House of Representatives to join me in saluting these two fine philanthropists and entrepreneurs, John Cullen and Bernard Kennedy, for their outstanding contributions to the Long Island community, and to congratulate them on being awarded the Long Island Association's 1994 Medal of Honor.

HONOR IN PUBLIC SERVICE: THE VALUE IN EFFORT

HON. LARRY LaROCCO

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. LAROCCO. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the privilege of attending the 11th annual Frank Church Conference on Public Affairs at Boise State University. As part of the conference on Honor in Public Service, Bryndi Joyce, a senior at Boise High School was awarded first prize for her essay, entitled, "The Value in Effort." I ask that the essay be printed in the RECORD.

FIRST-PLACE ESSAY PRAISES VALUE OF HELPING OTHERS

The following is the text of an essay written by Bryndi Joyce, a senior at Boise High School. The essay won first place in a contest sponsored by the Frank Church Conference on Public Affairs. The topic is, "Who Me? Responsibility to Public Service."

THE VALUE IN EFFORT

It is hard for me to imagine a life without endless opportunities. Having a father who devotes his time to saving the lives of others, knowing wonderful teachers, and being a volunteer has allowed me to experience the benefits of public service. I realize that my success is a result of others, and by becoming more publicly involved, I can give this time and devotion back to society.

My father's occupation as a firefighter has driven me towards public involvement throughout my life. I see his happiness each time he has saved the life of another human being, or risks his own life at times when others are in need. His efforts have embodied the importance of providing services for the public, because without people to fill these jobs, society could not function. People too often take these services for granted, and fail to imagine what it would be like without firefighters to extinguish the burning flames of a house. My father's occupation has also demonstrated that one's willingness to give up something brings about a stronger community. My family and I have witnessed his sacrifices for public safety as he works 24-hours shifts and often misses out on valuable sleep. I, too, want to help the individuals who have given up their own time for me.

The teachers who devote energy and thought into students' learning provide another source of public service that cannot be appreciated enough. Considering the amount of time a teacher spends with a student each day, the teacher becomes one of the greatest influences in developing our minds and attitudes. I have been fortunate enough to know individuals who have shown me that my efforts do make a difference. These teachers have encouraged me, as well as other students, to have a voice in society and value our own opinions. This motivates me to be a part of school clubs and organizations because I know that my ideas are important in helping others succeed.

I believe that others would become more involved with clubs and volunteering if they realized the power each individual has in shaping society. I would like to be in a position that encourages every type of student to develop and pursue his/her talents, and provide an atmosphere where students can become familiar with playing a part in society. I can, and by devoting my time to individuals who need tutoring or improvement in certain areas, inspire students to take part in public services. Once a person sees that my effort to help them are making a difference, he/she can also do the same for someone else. A teacher's positive attitude and enthusiasm offer a basis for students to learn the benefits of public service.

Volunteering to serve the public has demonstrated that individual efforts benefit society. Contributing services to our community is so important in preventing crime and maintaining a healthy atmosphere for everyone.

Unfortunatley, I see many individuals steering towards private business jobs and concerning themselves with only their personal goals. More responsibility must be taken by everyone in order to create better education systems and a less violent country. There are no quick solutions to these problems facing society, but the best measure for prevention is to assume an active role in helping troubled teens or other individuals who need direction. Designing youth involvement programs makes volunteer work more accessible, allowing students to see that a solution to violence and crime relies on their own individual effort. As students see that their efforts are valued by teachers and other citizens, they will have a greater interest to continue public involvement.

I feel that this attitude is implemented by those around us. Teachers, parents, and other people who are serving the public should encourage more students to have a functioning voice in society. This influence will allow students to recognize a responsibility for the well-being of citizens at the same time they are pursuing personal goals and interests.

Those who aspire to "save the earth" or "change the world" often fail to recognize that achieving these goals depends on their dedication to get people involved with public service. My individual efforts can encourage others to have a more active voice in society, and as James Baldwin suggests, our aspirations for a better community will begin to take place. "The world will change according to the way people see it, and if you alter, even by a millimeter, the way a person sees reality, then you can change (the world)."

TRIBUTE TO LOUIS A. FAZZANO

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an outstanding Rhode Islander, Louis A. Fazzano who is being honored by the Providence Rotary as their distinguished citizen of the year.

Mr. Fazzano has been a leader in Rhode Island for many years and he is known for his success as a businessman, his commitment to community service and his unselfish dedication to charitable and philanthropic endeavors.

Mr. Fazzano began his succession of accomplishments and service to Rhode Island when he moved here in 1946. After 37 years, he retired from the Imperial Knife Co., Inc., as its treasurer and chief administrative officer and within a year, he was named director of the Rhode Island Department of Economic Development. During his stewardship of Rhode Island's lead economic development agency, he led an aggressive campaign to bring new industry to the State, while at the same time, expanding existing businesses and developing the tourism industry in Rhode Island.

Louis Fazzano then left state service to embark on the difficult challenge of restoring financial stability to an institution which today is one of the State's largest employers, Rhode Island Hospital.

When Mr. Fazzano became president of Rhode Island Hospital in 1989, his leadership and dedication reversed the hospital's record deficit of $18.5 million to a break-even position in only 3 years. His keen business sense and unwavering determination are evident and his efforts have been instrumental in the hospital's emergence as a leader in healthcare, research and education. At the end of 1993, Mr. Fazzano retired as chairman of the board of trustees.

Mr. Fazzano's leadership qualities and results-oriented attitude have earned him the respect and affection of many, and I urge my colleagues to join me in honoring an outstanding Rhode Islander, Louis A. Fazzano.

BOYS' TOWNS OF ITALY MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. JACK QUINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct pleasure today to rise in honor of a gentleman from my district who was recently named the Boys' Towns of Italy 1994 Man of the Year, Roger L. Palczewski.

Roger Palczewski is a lifelong resident of Buffalo. He attended St. Francis High School and graduated from the University of Buffalo with a B.S. in Administration. Roger returned to St. Francis to serve as business administrator after service in the U.S. Air Force.

Roger Palczewski has been very active in the dairy industry—an extremely important industry to the western New York. Roger is the former president and chief executive officer of Sorrento, Inc. and its subsidiaries. He began his career with the Sorrento Cheese Co. in 1972 as controller and later became senior vice president finance and senior vice president administrative.

Currently, a member of the board for Perry's Ice Cream Company, Inc. and Rosina Food Products, Inc., Roger continues to work for the best interests of dairy producers and processors. Roger has been active as a member of the National Cheese Institute and the American Producers of Italian Type Cheese Association.

Playing an important role in the community, Roger serves as a trustee at Hilbert College and is past director of Our Lady of Victory Hospital.

Along with his wife Carol and their children Todd, Tracey, and Jennifer, Roger Palczewski makes enormous contributions to Buffalo and is always willing to offer his support and assistance.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in extending hearty congratulations and best wishes to the Boys' Towns of Italy Man of the Year, Roger Palczewski.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BUILDING HEIGHTS ACT OF 1994

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am today reintroducing the District of Columbia Building Heights Act of 1994. This legislation was originally introduced on March 23, 1994.

While certain provisions have been modified, its purpose and essential elements remain unchanged. It confirms the limitations Congress enacted in the 1910 Height of Buildings Act and the intent that it be strictly construed.

When Washington, DC, was granted home rule in 1973, Congress expressly prohibited the city from raising the height limit. In 1991, Congress acted to prevent a waiver of the height limit for a proposed Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation building. Unfortunately, there are numerous examples of successful efforts to avoid the Height Act which were not brought to the attention of Congress. This bill is intended to prevent vitiation of the 1910 statute by administrative action.

Mr. Speaker, I did receive a number of useful suggestions regarding the original version of the District of Columbia Building Heights Act of 1994, and have incorporated many of them into the bill introduced today.

I have deleted from my original bill several provisions better left to the local process, particularly since the National Capital Planning Commission will be more closely involved in that process in the future. Unlike the original bill, the version introduced today would not require all towers, minarets, spires, and similar structures to be set back from exterior walls.

The bill will also allow a penthouse to be built out to an outside wall that directly abuts another building whose roof is as high or higher, and grants some administrative discretion in truly unusual circumstances. I have also expanded the buildings to which the modifications would apply and clarified the authority of National Capital Planning Commission members to enforce the height limits.

Because it is clearly a matter of Federal interest to defend the height limits and preserve the character of our Capital City, Mr. Speaker, I plan to move quickly on this legislation. I will press for swift committee and floor consideration of the measure.

THE PUBLIC HOUSING MORASS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to commend to his colleagues the following editorial from the April 15, 1994, Washington Times, concerning the corruption and scandal surrounding the District of Columbia's Department of Public and Assisted Housing.

Both daily newspapers in the city have condemned the mismanagement, corruption and betrayal of the District's citizens by this agency. As the Washington Post reported on April 15, 1994, the Department of Housing and Urban Development will move to establish more oversight over the District's housing programs. The Post reported that "One of the first changes will be for the District's housing department to put all Federal funds it receives into a bank account separate from those used by other city agencies." Certainly this is a needed step, and one which should have been taken long ago.

[From the Washington Times, April 15, 1994]

THE PUBLIC HOUSING MORASS

Now we know why thousands of families can languish on waiting lists for public housing in the District, some for as many as seven years: They don't have enough money to bribe their way into an apartment. The allegations of bribery lodged against five employees of the Department of Public and Assisted Housing (DPAH) are absolutely stunning. Of about 400 tenants who received housing assistance payments over the past four years, as few as 15 did so through proper channels, according to a two-year investigation.

Some people held the process in such disregard that they acted as brokers, coordinating bribes between friends and relatives and housing employees. One top administrator allegedly sent vouchers, which are used as money to subsidize rent for the poorest tenants, to her sister in Chicago. Meanwhile, families unable to afford housing try to play it by the rules and end up waiting it out in city shelters or on the streets.

The question is not whether the District's Department of Public and Assisted Housing should be placed into receivership, but when. Corruption is evidently so extensive and mismanagement so thorough that only a body that is independent of city politics will be able to actually "see" the problems, fix them and prevent them from occurring again.

The bribery investigation began in early 1992 courtesy of Ray Price, who was then director of DPAH. He notified police and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development that he suspected grants were being exchanged for bribes. The FBI joined the probe in 1993. Not long afterward, Mr. Price quit, having run headlong into the same obstacles that frustrated several of his predecessors—a politically motivated, meddlesome administration.

Receivership is the recommendation of the special master appointed by a D.C. Superior Court judge last spring to identify the source of the department's malfunction. Clearly, something drastic is needed to wrench the agency out of its chronic misery. Nothing else has worked so far—certainly not the stream of a dozen directors in 15 years, not

scathing reports from federal reviewers, not the threat of fines from the court and not a new mayor with big promises.

Politics is the precise factor that has kept public housing mired in its persistent problems. Public housing units have become no more than convenient backdrops for capturing political agendas in photo opportunities. That was true of the last administration and is no less true of the present one. Removing the mayor's office from the formula seems a sensible idea.

Politics, after all, is what drove the passionate though unrealistic promises Mayor Sharon Pratt Kelly made three years ago about restoring 2,200 units within 18 months. She was completely unaware of the land mines, from unhelpful personnel rules to incompetence to (it appears now) corruption.

She made an impossible vow, and when the heat came on she rolled a head. The last one belonged to Robert Jenkins, who was canned after less than a year on the job despite a court recommendation to keep him in place. He succeeded Mr. Price, who also was appointed by Mrs. Kelly. One of Mr. Stockard's earlier reports had pinpointed the continued problems to the constant change in directors.

Naturally, Mayor Kelly and city leaders are resistant to a takeover. It is a political liability to concede turf or have it snatched from you at any time, let alone in an election year. The administration reportedly is contemplating creation of a special five-member policy-making board that would provide the department with direction. But with the mayor as chairman, as the mayor proposes, such a board will be useless. What seems to have escaped notice here is that the mayor's office and her practice of excessive interference have been identified as major stumbling blocks to progress at DPAH.

No one doubts that Mayor Kelly and other city leaders truly want to improve public housing in the District. The problem is that many of them have been at it for more than a decade, and their heartfelt desires are not turning into results. If results there are to be, they are probably going to have to come from the outside.

PREVENT A BLATANT VIOLATION OF FEDERAL LAW

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today, I join the ranking minority member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, Mr. BILLEY, in introducing legislation to stop a blatant and unquestionable violation of Federal law. Specifically, the current building designed for relocating the studios of WETA television station on the campus of George Washington University violates the 1910 Height Act. What we have found takes this controversy far beyond a matter of mere differing views of architectural technicalities, but rather illustrates a rather shrewd—and nearly successful—attempt to sneak around longstanding Federal law.

Simply, the issue is this: The original GW/WETA proposal clearly stated that their building was over 116 feet high and that the appropriate Height Act limitation was 130 feet. There are numerous official documents from both the GW/WETA applicants and the District of Columbia government stating the building's height at more than 116 feet. However, they had made an error because the maximum height allowed on this site under the Height Act is only 110 feet.

When they discovered their error, instead of reviewing and redesigning the building, GW/WETA simply introduced an invisible roof. When the D.C. Zoning Administrator ruled that this nonsense failed compliance, the D.C. Zoning Commission allowed GW/WETA to submit a revised plan which simply added a solid line at 110 feet and labeled it "solid studio roof." No details were requested or required, and opponents were not allowed to ask questions about the revised plan, which was approved last week.

The District of Columbia Zoning Commission and a misinformed National Capital Planning Commission have mistakenly approved construction of a building that exceeds the federally prescribed height limit for any structure placed at that location. I say misinformed NCPC because they were never told about the above history of the project. The applicants have never voluntarily disclosed these material facts. A manipulation of the original design involving redesignation of the roof is the most egregious, but not the only, attempt to evade the Height Act in the planned construction of the GW/WETA building.

Our bill to prohibit the planned construction is not a case of improper interference with local regulation. Congress has intended for centuries to protect the unique skyline of our Nation's Capital from overzealous development. Protection of this city's skyline was, is, and will remain a matter of the Federal interest.

In 1991, Congress acted to disapprove a D.C. City Council act that would have raised the height limit for a Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation building. The legislation we are introducing today similarly stops administrative action that would vitiate the 1910 Act. And as guardians of that Federal interest, we are required to identify and guard against such assaults. No one is above the law.

We intend to move this bill through to final passage expeditiously. We urge our colleagues to support us.

PIRACY OF U.S. PATENTS AND COPYRIGHTS COSTS OUR COMPANIES BILLIONS

HON. SAM GEJDENSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to get companies like Pfizer pharmaceutical of Groton, CT, real help in combating the theft of American know-how.

The piracy of U.S. patents and copyrights by foreign countries costs our companies $15 to 17 billion each year. That means over 300,000 American jobs are put at risk every year by foreign pirates. Pharmaceutical companies like Pfizer lose $5 billion or more each and every year, jeopardizing at least 100,000 American jobs.

America's strongest asset in this competitive world is its ingenuity and its creativity. From the pencil-making machine to the microchip, U.S. inventors have created millions of groundbreaking products over the years. But products like these are being stolen every day by countries that have no respect for the rights of the inventor. From the scientists who invent the products to the men and women who make and ship them, American workers are being ripped off by foreign pirates.

My legislation would put a stop to that by calling on the administration to use every possible policy lever, including withholding trade benefits, to end the thievery of our intellectual property.

And for those countries that are earnestly trying to stop the thievery but do not have the wherewithal to do so, my legislation helps them to get the training and technology needed to put in place a real system of intellectual property protection.

Everything that Americans create or invent for the marketplace gets a patent or copyright in this country to ensure that the creators get a return for their labors. No less should be expected in other countries that want to benefit from our ingenuity and creativity. Whether they want to get relief from common arthritis pain, or to keep their accounts on Lotus 1–2–3 or just to watch a Steven Spielberg movie, foreign benefactors of American ingenuity should pay for the privilege.

RUSSIAN IMPERIAL DECREE

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert into the RECORD the following decree signed on April 5 by President Yeltsin of Russia.

The decree declares that Russia will build several military bases in the Commonwealth of Independent States and Latvia. Mr. Speaker, this is truly an ominous development. Russian foreign policy has become more and more aggressive over the past year, and this latest decree seems to confirm the worst of our fears.

Russian retractions on Latvia's inclusion in the decree, claiming that it was a technical error, are not to be taken at face value. Recall, Mr. Speaker, that Soviet maps from 1939, before the Baltic annexations of 1940, had already begun to show the Baltics as Soviet territory. When asked about this, Stalin replied that the maps were a "mistake."

While the decree does allude to "negotiations" with these other countries, there is in the decree an air of inevitability. The Russians are obviously assuming that the other countries will capitulate.

And given the Moscow-Washington tag team against the former Soviet Republics, it is probably a good bet that they will. Economic and military threats by Moscow combined with economic carrots and political threats by Washington have already broken the will of several former Soviet Republics.

Witness the case of Latvia. As several thousand Russian troops continue to loiter in that

Baltic country, the Clinton administration recently pressured the Latvians to be "more accommodative" to Russian concerns and held out the prospects of further aid to Latvia. The result was the initialing of a pact which called for the final withdrawal of Russian troops by August 31, but only under the conditions that the Russians will continue to operate a radar base in Latvia and that the Latvian Government will pay the pension of thousands of Russian military retirees. This is not the way it was supposed to be, Mr. Speaker.

Or how about Ukraine? The Moscow-Washington axis was successful in pressuring President Kravchuk into unilateral nuclear disarmament, and everybody applauded. But given recent events, and especially this decree, does anybody seriously still believe that Ukrainian nuclear weapons represent the threat in that part of the world?

Mr. Speaker, the Eurasian Continent is on the verge of a great deal of trouble, and the Clinton administration seems oblivious. Congress must stand up and be heard. I thank the Speaker for the time and submit the text of the decree for the RECORD.

DECREE BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE RUSSIAN FEDERATION

APRIL 5, 1994.

Consent to the proposal of Russia's Defense Ministry, which has been approved by Russia's Foreign Affairs Ministry, to create Russian Federation military (hard to read, perhaps, "eight") bases on the territory of CIS and Latvia, to ensure the security of the Russian Federation and the above named nations, as well as to test new weapons and military machinery.

The Russian Foreign Affairs Ministry, together with the Defense Ministry and other interested ministries and departments of the Russian Federation are to negotiate this question with CIS members and the Republic of Latvia and the obtained agreements have to be formulated by appropriate documents.

B. YELTSIN.

MANAGEMENT WEEK IN AMERICA

HON. ELTON GALLEGLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. GALLEGLY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the men and women who play a critical but sometimes underappreciated role in keeping America in business—the Nation's managers.

This year marks the 16th observance of Management Week in America. Sponsored by the National Management Association, the week of June 5–11 has been set aside to recognize management as a valued profession and to promote our American competitive enterprise system.

Since it's inception in 1978 by the National Management Association, Management Week in America has grown each year in size and scope, and deservedly so. For just as we need people with vision to develop the ideas that keep America moving forward and people with the skills to produce the goods and services that result from those ideas, so too do we need the people to ensure that those ideas are carried out.

The National Management Association, with more than 60,000 members in 200 chapters covering the spectrum of American business, industry and the public sector, helps those managers improve their skills and abilities, and contributes to improving our productivity and our economy. Founded in 1925 in Dayton, OH, the association is a nonprofit, nonpolitical educational society committed to fostering the development of individuals as managers through personal effort, motivation, and participation.

I would like to pay special recognition today to the association's Rockwell Valley Chapter, which has more than 1,100 members located at Rockwell facilities in Canoga Park, Chatsworth, Santa Susana, Westlake Village, and Thousand Oaks.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in commemorating Management Week in America, and in supporting policies to make our free enterprise system stronger and even more capable of meeting the economic challenges of the years ahead.

RWANDA'S SITUATION BEARS WATCHING

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I come before my colleagues today to bring attention to the atrocities occurring in Rwanda. To date, 20,000 have been massacred as a result of conflicts between warring factions. The world is witnessing the mass exodus of foreigners from Rwanda in the aftermath of the killing of its President in a plane crash explosion along with the former President of Burundi.

It is important for those of us who cherish the notion of democracy and freedom, to raise our voices in support of the notion of democratic rule, but against wanton killing and political repression. At the same time, it is important that we not typify this as a tribal conflict, because it is in fact a political conflict among principals who happen to be from different tribes.

The stated goal of the rebels warring against the military government is to implement a democratic government. It is a lofty goal indeed. However, the method, the chaos, and the human toll being exacted is beyond comprehension. I ask my colleagues to be equally mindful of the scenario being played out in Africa, as we have in other parts of the world. We should not send the wrong message, that African lives are of less importance than those being lost in other parts of the world.

WESTERN NORTH CAROLINA SMALL BUSINESS HEALTH CARE INITIATIVE

HON. CHARLES H. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, Congress and the Nation have been debating health care. Being a small businessman myself, I have been concerned that this debate has often excluded the impact to our largest provider of jobs in this country, the small businesses.

In western North Carolina, small businesses provide 90 percent of the jobs for our people. More than two-thirds of the new jobs created in our country come from small businesses.

We must include the impact of any health care initiative by Congress on our small employers. In western North Carolina, it is encouraging to report of a new initiative being undertaken to assist small businesses with health care for their employees. I believe Congress should provide for alternatives such as the one being undertaken in my district.

In 1993, the North Carolina General Assembly passed a bill allowing regional health care purchasing cooperatives. Specifically, the measure was aimed at allowing businesses with 50 employees or less to pool their financial resources to shop more effectively for health care insurance. This will increase the affordability, efficiency, and fairness of health coverage for small businesses.

Following the ratification of this bill, the Asheville Area Chamber of Commerce established a communitywide team to evaluate prospects for creating a voluntary small business health alliance. This 20-person panel was comprised of physicians, hospital administration officials, health educators, small business owners, and insurance professionals. They named the WNC initiative Health Link.

Health Link will become North Carolina's first voluntary alliance of small businesses dedicated to reducing the costs associated with health care insurance for small businesses across western North Carolina.

Health Link will be administered by a newly chartered private, nonprofit corporation. Health Link will work through chambers of commerce and other business organizations. Health Link will develop a system for qualifying agents to sell approved health plans and provide regular education programs to assure that agents maintain the latest information on current plans.

Health Link will drive down insurance costs to small businesses by providing competition for alliance business among insurance companies and developing a large pool of alliance participants.

The principle which will make Health Link successful is that small business will gain bargaining power from strength in numbers. Health Link is allowing the free enterprise system to work.

It is an honor for me to be a community sponsor for Health Link. I look forward to sharing this concept with other Members of Congress as we proceed in our health care debate.

TRIBUTE TO OTIS CHIDESTER

HON. ED PASTOR

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. PASTOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to honor Mr. Otis H.

Chidester, who on April 5, 1993, became the oldest man in history fo receive the Distinguished Eagle Scout Award from the National Council of the Boy Scouts of America. This award recognizes men who have been an Eagle Scout for at least 25 years, have distinguished themselves in their chosen profession, and have accumulated an exceptional record in community service.

On June 12, 1912, in Susquehanna, PA, Otis Chidester joined the Boy's Brigade which later merged with the Boy Scouts of America. Over the years, Mr. Chidester received numerous honors in connection with his service. Today, over 80 years later, Otis is still actively involved with the Boy Scouts. He is only the sixth man to accomplish 80 years of service. Currently, Mr. Chidester is in his 31st year as Scout historian and is acknowledged as the dean of all Boy Scout Council historians in the United States.

Mr. Chidester received an M.A. degree in education at the University of Arizona and taught for 43 years before his retirement in 1973. He and his wife, Martha, spent many of their summers at Camp Lawton where he served as camp director. In 1940, Mr. Chidester founded the graphic arts department at Tucson High School and served as departmental chairman for 28 years. He is also the founder, curator, and benefactor of the Otis H. Chidester Scout Museum of Southern Arizona.

At 91 years of age, Otis is the Nation's and the world's senior living active Boy Scout. His distinguished contributions to society serve as an example to the youth of Arizona and should be commended. Mr. Chidester, thank you for your years of dedication and hard work and service to our community, State, and Nation.

ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, central New York is a place of diverse cultures, very much a cross-section of America in the late 20th century. Our Nation is stronger because of immigrants who have come searching for freedom. Among those groups are Armenian Americans, who have thrived in my hometown and have laid groundwork for their children's future. Sadly, as we salute their hard work and faith, we must mention in the same breath the very reason most Armenians came to America. Because today, as we do each April, we force ourselves to remember the Armenian genocide, a holocaust victimizing not only the 1.5 million people massacred by the Turkish Ottoman Empire, but those who were forced to abandon their ancient homeland.

The details of the inhumanity are repulsive to us who live side-by-side with children and grandchildren of the survivors. We remember, easily in some cases, the prejudice has taken many forms against many groups of immigrants. But in few cases has the horror of intense hatred in the homeland reached a level of viciousness that it bears the name of genocide. This has been true of the Armenian people.

I sympathize today with the descendants of those who died, and those who came to America. I condemn the acts, past and present, which are carried out against a people in the name of nationalism or any other cause. And I thank God with my Armenian American friends today that they have brought their culture to our great Nation. Their children will carry forward their customs, their pride, their spirit into the ages, and all our children are better for knowing this.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting Armenian Americans on this day, and in condemning the aggression of genocide against their ancestors.

COMMEMORATING THE 79TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE ARMENIAN GENOCIDE

HON. JACK REED

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join the Armenian-American community in Rhode Island and across the Nation in commemorating the 79th anniversary of the Armenian genocide.

In this month in 1915, the religious, political and intellectual leaders of the Armenian community in the Ottoman Empire were rounded up and exiled from their homes. Over the next 8 years, they, and 1.5 million other Armenian men, women, and children were executed by the brutal Ottoman regime. Where before there stood a thriving community of 2,500,000, now only 80,000 remain. Where there were once mothers and fathers, sons and daughters, friends and relatives, now there are only memories.

To the world's horror, the Government of Turkey continues to deny that the massacre occurred. In doing so, they deny the very existence of the 1½ million people who were killed.

As long as this policy of denial continues, we must redouble our determination to uphold the memory of the victims of the slaughter and make the truth known. Not only for those who perished, but for those Armenians who are suffering today, and for those who are yet to be born.

CRIME BILL STRAYS INTO SOCIAL PROGRAMS

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member would like to commend to his colleagues the following editorial from the April 18, 1994, Omaha World-Herald, concerning the anticrime measure pending before the House. Crime prevention programs are important, and must be adequately funded, yet, as the editorial makes clear, the majority party's leadership has confused fighting crime with creating expensive social programs. It is a thoughtful editorial and this Member urges his colleagues to heed its message.

[From the Omaha World-Herald, Apr. 18, 1994]

CRIME BILL STRAYS INTO SOCIAL PROGRAMS

Christmastime returns in April to Capitol Hill. At least that's how it appears as Santa Claus wannabes in Congress decorate the crime bill with additional ornaments.

For cities, the House version includes $6.9 billion in community-based crime "prevention" programs. That's nearly half the cost of the bill—and all for social programs that may or may not have any effect on the crime rate.

Congress would pay local governments to run midnight sports leagues. It would create yet another jobs program. The House version includes $2 billion that would be sent to cities under a revenue-sharing plan. Cities wouldn't have to apply for the money but would get it automatically according to a formula based on the number of residents who met poverty guidelines. Recipients would be encouraged to use the money for health and education programs.

The $6.9 billion package for cities isn't the only gift that Santa Congress plans to leave. For trial attorneys, the package includes the so-called Racial Justice Act. The residents of the nation's death rows could use it to clog court dockets with even more appeals. It would give the government's blessing to the use of sentencing statistics to challenge the death penalty as racically discriminatory.

Congress sometimes seems to confuse creating more court cases with fighting crime. That confusion is apparent in the Violence Against Women Act, another "anti-crime" measure that isn't included in the main crime bill.

Violence against women is a problem in this country, to be sure. But it's hard to see how this bill would stop violence against women. The bill would allow a person to file a civil suit to seek compensation for an assault by a person of the opposite sex. A woman who was assaulted by her husband's girlfriend couldn't sue, for example, but an abusive husband could use the act to sue his wife if she fought back. The bill could also open the door for women to harass men with civil suits on the basis of alleged assaults for which no evidence existed to justify a criminal charge.

Putting real teeth in sentences for rape and assault would do more to prevent violence against women than would this misguided act.

Fighting crime means putting police officers on the streets, prosecuting cases in a timely manner and handing down sentences that provide real punishment. It also means restoring respect for authority and reverence for the sanctity of the family—a field in which government has so far displayed little ability to bring about a positive effect.

In Congress, fighting crime apparently still means forking over huge sums of cash for questionable social programs and pushing the agenda of interest groups in search of a vehicle to carry their politically correct cause. It hasn't reduced crime in the past, and there's no reason to assume that it would in the future.

CLEANING UP FLORIDA BAY

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend to my colleagues, the following article from the Miami Herald on April 18, written by Donald Smith.

HOW SOON IS SOON ENOUGH TO CLEAN UP FLORIDA BAY?

ISLAMORADA.—It was a sunny Florida Keys morning, the kind of day when death should have been on vacation. Charter fishing guide John Kipp revved up his 16-foot skiff and joked with his two passengers as they glided through flat bay water and headed for Rabbit Key. They were after big game: tarpon, which they would cut loose after capture to allow the silver monsters to fight again another day.

Kipp saw the dead fish about eight miles out. Hundreds, perhaps thousands of them were lying on their sides, motionless except for the rocking caused by the boat's bow wave as he throttled back for a better look. The button-like eyes of the fish stared into the sun, as if in shock.

"They were not small fish," Kipp recalls. "These were large snappers, barracuda. It certainly wasn't a good sign."

The fish devastation that Kipp saw last August has become a distressingly common sight in Florida Bay, a 1,040-square-mile wedge of water, between the Florida Keys and the Gulf of Mexico, once haunted by the likes of Zane Grey and Ernest Hemingway.

Everyone agrees that Florida Bay is dying. The question is how to bring it back to life. As it expires, it threatens to take with it much of South Florida's sport and commercial fishing industry.

Floridians also fear harm to other natural assets, including 500,000 acres of mangroves that line the shores and islands, and the chain of coral reefs just offshore in the Atlantic Ocean that annually draw hordes of scuba divers and snorkelers.

Dusky blooms of algae sometimes stain as much as half of the bay. The brown and green smudges suck up oxygen that fish need for life and choke off beds of sea grass and sponges that lobsters, stone crabs, and other species call home.

"This is an ecosystem on the verge of collapse," says Michael Collins, an Islamorada charter boat owner who used to help run fishing expeditions for President Bush and his friends.

"Just five years ago you could read a newspaper lying on the bottom through 10 feet of water," Collins tells National Geographic. "Now, sometimes the visibility is less than six inches."

Commercial fishermen and marine scientists report declines of 80 percent in catches of pink shrimp and 30 percent in juvenile spiny lobsters. Average lobster catches on the east side of the bay are down 40 percent, and commercial catches of pompano and mackerel have plummeted by 75 percent. The damage is all the more remarkable because it has occurred in an area nominally protected by the federal government. The bay is part of Everglades National Park.

For years, environmentalists, along with fishermen and others who depend on Florida Bay for a living, have argued that the chief culprit has been the diversion of fresh water that once flowed into the bay from the Everglades. That view is now disputed by scientists who blame high nitrogen levels caused by pesticides and other chemicals.

Since early in the century, water has been siphoned off from the vast wetlands to the north to create farmland, control flooding, and provide drinking water for cities on both of Florida's coasts. Today 1,364 miles of canals drain off more than a trillion gallons of water a year. Park hydrologists estimate that the bay now receives as little as 10 percent of the fresh water that it once did.

These diversions, the environmentalists say, have upset the delicate balance between fresh water and salt water that sustains Florida Bay's diverse plant and animal life, elevating salinity levels, and setting off chains of destruction.

All this has produced a bitter struggle between the bay advocates and the farmers whose livelihoods depend on the diverted water. After years of controversy and delay, state, and federal agencies have agreed that the way to save the bay is to restore the flow of fresh water.

The Army Corps of Engineers recently proposed that the federal government buy a belt of farmland north of the bay to act as a buffer zone between the Everglades and other farmland. The immense plumbing system would be redesigned to restore much of the freshwater flow into the bay. The initial estimated cost of the whole project is $100 million.

Other scientists argue that the biggest problem isn't salinity, but pollution. Some say that chemical runoff from farms and cities raises the levels of nitrogen in bay waters, sustaining the death-producing algae. Others attribute the high nitrogen content to decaying sea grasses.

Principal proponent of the runoff view is marine biologist Brian LaPointe, who operates an independent laboratory at Florida's Big Pine Key. "Nutrient pollution is the No. 1 threat to water quality in Florida Bay," he says. "Adding more water is like adding fuel to the fire."

Last September a panel of experts, convened at the request of Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt, decided that more research is needed.

Bruce Rosendahl, dean of the University of Miami's Rosenstiel School of Marine and Atmospheric Science, advocates a federally financed two-year study of the bay's ecosystem. "We think lack of water flow into the bay is certainly a problem," he says. "But it's probably a complex series of issues, including pollution. I would like to know what the entire problem is before I start dumping money into any one part of it."

In the meantime, veteran fisherman John Kipp doubts that anything will be done soon: "We'll probably all be dead before it's cleaned up."

RECOGNITION OF ROBERT LESLIE AND HOME BUILDERS INTERNATIONAL OF HOPKINS, MN

HON. MARTIN OLAV SABO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 18, 1994

Mr. SABO. Mr. Speaker, it is all too easy, unfortunately, for those of us who take the roof over our heads for granted, to disregard what it means to live without clean, safe housing. Yet, one of every four people on Earth, including many Americans, is faced with these circumstances. Their plight is made painfully clear to us when a natural disaster, such as the midwestern floods, the Los Angeles earthquake, or Hurricane Andrew, ravages a region of our country and leaves our family members or friends without shelter.

That's why, Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to share with my colleagues an article that appeared in last week's Parade magazine about a revolutionary new type of house—one that can be built for less than $5,000, yet is durable enough to withstand hurricane-force winds, seismic shock, and resist cold, heat, and humidity. The inventor of this UniHome concept, Robert Leslie, produces these homes at Home Builders International in Hopkins, MN.

I know my colleagues will want to join me in congratulating Home Builders International for its success in applying innovative technology to one of today's most pressing domestic and global human needs.

The article from Parade, "A Different Kind of House" follows:

A DIFFERENT KIND OF HOUSE

In recent months—because of recurring natural disasters across the U.S., like the fires, earthquakes and mudslides that hit California—many Americans have experienced housing problems similar to those in the Third World.

There is an urgent need for low-cost homes that can be assembled quickly. One out of every four people around the world—1.25 billion—lives in an unsanitary and unsafe shelter, according to the United Nations Center for Human Settlements. Now, many disaster victims in America and people in Third World nations may be able to obtain new, permanent housing, thanks to one man's creative idea.

I went to Hopkins, Minn., to meet that man—Robert Leslie, a 56-year-old inventor born in Australia—and to find out more about his creation.

For 26 years, Leslie had worked in more than 20 nations and designed farm equipment and building products. His idea for a new type of house came from a conversation in 1991 with Philip Johnston, present of CARE, the relief and development agency, Was it possible, Johnston wondered, to build a safe strong home that indigent governments, humanitarian groups and private developers in poor nations could afford? The typical core house of concrete block costs an average of $8000 worldwide. Could one be built for less than $5000?

Leslie went home and thought about it. Within months, he came up with an answer. First, he envisioned the "skin" of the house—the walls, windows, doors and roof—as a unique interlocking system. "I had used slots before in other inventions," Leslie explained, "and that was my solution." The house sections would be joined with deep grooves, slots and pockets—not nails and staples—and bound with strong adhesives, roof clips and foundation fasteners to create a "monolithic" structure.

By "thickening the skin" with more material at key points—corners, window and door frames, and trim—a network of posts, beams and headers evolved. The wall panels acted as diagonal braces, further enhancing the strength. The result was the Shelter Series house, designed to withstand hurricane-force winds and seismic shock.

Philip Johnston said Leslie "is on to something with his Shelter Series house that will

have great impact both through-out the Third World and the U.S."

Leslie builds the components for the Shelter Series house in Minnesota at his company, Home Builders International. The houses range in size from 320 square feet to more than 1000 square feet. The basic home costs about $4000. It is 20 feet long and 16 feet wide—small by Western standards but quite large in most developing nations. Larger models, which can accommodate several families, cost about $7000.

"I always had the idea of building housing for people in developing nations." Leslie told me. "Along with food and education, it is the most important challenge."

The durability of the houses was tested in Guam during the hurricane season two years ago. Despite the winds, the houses remained intact. Unlike a traditional home, which might fly apart from punishing winds, the Shelter Series house has no unbonded openings or corners. It locks together and works as one piece. In addition, it can be put together by two people in one day and is easy to transport. Electricity and plumbing are optional.

In Oglala, S.D., Adam and Ina Espinosa and their nine children have been enjoying their Shelter Series house since 1992. For nearly 10 years, the family was cramped inside a three-room trailer, but the four oldest boys now live in a four-room Shelter Series house, situated near the trailer. "It's worked out real good for us," said Adam. "There are no problems during bad weather."

The Espinosa family's home was assembled in three days by 12 high school students from the Good Samaritan Ministries of the Immanuel Lutheran Church of Palatine, Ill., led by their ministeries director, Tim Hetzner.

"It's quite exciting what Leslie has come up with," said Thomas H. Stahl, the architect who prepared the blueprints for Leslie's invention. "It fills the housing gap that Andrew created."

Stahl was referring to Hurricane Andrew, which left 160,000 people homeless in southern Florida 18 months ago. Currently, 1300 families remain without homes, according to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Although three Shelter series houses have been built there, none is inhabited, since the blueprints haven't been approved by country officials. "The bureaucracy is very slow," said Leslie.

In the past two years, Leslie's homes have been assembled—and inhabited—in Mexico and Micronesia, and more will soon appear on Pacific Ocean atolls and mountainsides in Central America. More than 100 were constructed last year on nine remote locations in the Marshall Islands, a U.S. protectorate in the Western Pacific.

Working with the Persons Helping People Foundation, a nonprofit organization, Home Builders International recently agreed to build 1200 houses in La Argentina, El Salvador, a hillside village populated mostly by refugees.

This project will be an important test for Leslie. It is based on the idea that the people of the village will learn how to make the material needed to create their homes from resources in their own environment. That material is another Leslie invention, called "enviroboard." It is made from a mixture of cement and crop residues—straw, rice or wheat shafts and husks, corn stalks, sugar cane, grasses, papyrus or other fibrous materials. By adding chemicals to bind the cement and the crop residues, entire house panels, rafters, headers and beams can be created right on the site. The enviroboard panels are cut into the precise pieces—including slots and pockets—needed to assemble the house.

"The people of La Argentina are very excited by the idea of building their homes and learning the technology to do it," said Michael A. Olson, the executive director of the Persons Helping People Foundation.

There is excitement in the U.S. as well. Last month, Leslie's company constructed 32 homes in Monte Alto, Tex, for employees at a large food-processing plant. They are now renting the homes for $250 to $300 a month. Each house measures 400 square feet.

"The North American Free Trade Agreement is bringing a lot of companies to the U.S.-Mexico border region, and there is a big need for well-built, affordable housing," said Leslie, who expects to construct more houses in the area.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, April 19, 1994, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 20

9:30 a.m.

Armed Services

To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, and to review the future years defense program, focusing on the unified commands military strategy and operational requirements.

SR-222

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings to review the Department of the Interior's proposed rule to amend the Department's regulations concerning livestock grazing, and on S. 1326, to establish a forage fee formula on lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, and S. 896, to revise the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 to promote ecologically healthy and biologically diverse ecosystems on rangelands used for domestic livestock grazing.

SD-366

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the regulation of Indian gaming.

SH-216

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on issues relating to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

SD-562

Appropriations

Treasury, Postal Service, General Government Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of the Treasury, and the United States Postal Service.

SD-116

Foreign Relations

Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations Subcommittee

To hold hearings on recent developments in transnational crime affecting United States law enforcement and foreign policy, the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty in Criminal Matters with Panama (Treaty Doc. 102-15), and the 1994 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report.

SD-419

Judiciary

Courts and Administrative Practice Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1404, to revise chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, relating to protective orders, sealing cases, and disclosures of discovery information in civil actions.

SD-226

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations Subcommittee

To continue hearings on recent developments in transnational crime affecting United States law enforcement and foreign policy, the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty in Criminal Matters with Panama (Treaty Doc. 102-15), and the 1994 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report.

SD-419

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation to authorize funds for programs of the Office of Government Ethics.

SD-342

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on intelligence programs.

S-407, Capitol

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

SD-106

Appropriations

Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Securities and Exchange Commission, and the Federal Communications Commission.

S-146, Capitol

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nominations of Ricardo Martinez, of Louisiana, to be Administrator, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, and Carrye Burley Brown, of the District of Columbia, to be Administrator, United States Fire Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency.
SD-628

Finance
To resume hearings on health care reform issues, focusing on access to medical care in rural and urban areas.
SD-215

Foreign Relations
Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations Subcommittee
To continue hearings on recent developments in transnational crime affecting United States law enforcement and foreign policy, the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty in Criminal Matters with Panama (Treaty Doc. 102-15), and the 1994 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report.
SD-419

Governmental Affairs
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.
SD-342

Labor and Human Resources
Education, Arts and Humanities Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1513, authorizing funds for programs of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
SD-430

Joint Economic
To hold a roundtable discussion on the state of the economy.
Room to be announced

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD-138

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on the nomination of William D. Hathaway, of Maine, and Joe Scroggins Jr., of Florida, each to be a Federal Maritime Commissioner.
SR-253

Foreign Relations
Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations Subcommittee
To continue hearings on recent developments in transnational crime affecting United States law enforcement and foreign policy, the Mutual Legal Assistance Treaty in Criminal Matters with Panama (Treaty Doc. 102-15), and the 1994 International Narcotics Control Strategy Report.
SD-419

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe
To hold a briefing to review the results of the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe Migrant Workers Seminar, held March 21-25, 1994 in Warsaw, Poland.
2359 Rayburn Building

2:30 p.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
Agricultural Research, Conservation, Forestry and General Legislation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review new management directives for the U.S. Forest Service.
SD-628

Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1509, to transfer a parcel of land to the Taos Pueblo Indians of New Mexico, S. 1897, the Santa Fe National Forest Boundary Adjustment Act, S. 1975 and H.R. 2921, bills to establish a grant program to restore and preserve historic buildings at historically black colleges and universities, S. 1980, the Cane River Creole National Historical Park and National Heritage Area Act, and S. 1919, the Rio Puerco Watershed Act.
SD-366

Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on the nominations of William J. Crowe, Jr., of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and Ralph R. Johnson, of Virginia, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Coordinator of the Support for East European Democracy (SEED) Program.
SD-226

Judiciary
To hold hearings on the nominations of Carl E. Stewart, of Louisiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Fifth Circuit, James G. Carr, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Ohio, Mary M. Lisi, to be United States District Judge for the District of Rhode Island, Frank M. Hull, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, W. Louis Sands, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Georgia, and Clarence Cooper, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia.
SD-226

Select on Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on intelligence matters.
SH-219

APRIL 22

9:00 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings to examine the Administration's compromise with Venezuela regarding changing the final reformulated gasoline rule.
SD-406

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine waste, fraud, and abuse in the health care industry.
SD-192

Armed Services
Defense Technology, Acquisition, and Industrial Base Subcommittee
To resume hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, and the future years defense program, focusing on research, development, test and evaluation infrastructure.
SR-222

APRIL 25

10:00 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 1945, to authorize funds for fiscal year 1995 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation.
SR-253

Finance
Health for Families and the Uninsured Subcommittee
To hold hearings on health care reform issues, focusing on consumer protection and quality assurance.
SD-215

2:00 p.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, Natural Resources and Environment, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Foreign Agriculture Service, Soil Conservation Service, and Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, all of the Department of Agriculture.
SD-138

APRIL 26

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
Nuclear Deterrence, Arms Control, and Defense Intelligence Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, and the future years defense program, focusing on the chemical demilitarization program.
SR-222

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold closed hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on National Foreign Intelligence Programs (NFIP) and Tactical Intelligence and Related Activities (TIARA).
S-407, Capitol

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Office of Justice Programs, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, both of the Department of Justice.
S-146, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Business meeting, to mark up S. 1587, to revise and streamline the acquisition laws of the Federal Government.
SR-222

APRIL 27

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To resume hearings on S. 1350, to provide for an expanded Federal program of hazards mitigation and insurance against the risk of catastrophic natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions.
SR-253

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Fed-

eral Transit Administration, Department of Transportation, and the Washington Metro Transit Authority.
SD–138

Veterans' Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on dangerous exposures in the Persian Gulf War.
SD–G50

APRIL 28

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
To resume hearings to examine the impact of unfunded Federal mandates on how State and local governments provide programs, services, and activities, and on related measures including S. 563, S. 648, S. 993, and S. 1604.
SD–342

Rules and Administration
To resume hearings on S. 1824, to improve the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Branch, focusing on Subtitle A, Parts I and II of Title III, relating to Congressional biennial budgeting and additional budget process changes.
SR–301

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Council on Environmental Quality.
SD–106

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Information Agency.
S–146, Capitol

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior.
SD–116

MAY 3

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on Boron-Neutron Cancer Therapy.
SD–366

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for Food and Consumer Services, Food and Nutrition Service, and Human Nutrition Information Service, all of the Department of Agriculture.
SD–138

Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on defense conversion programs.
SD–192

MAY 5

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To resume hearings on S. 1824, to improve the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Branch, focusing on Title III, Subtitle B (Staffing, Administration, and Support Agencies), and Subtitle C (Abolishing the Joint Committees).
SR–301

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Legal Services Corporation.
S–146, Capitol

Appropriations
Transportation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Transportation Safety Board, and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.
SD–138

MAY 10

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development, and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, the Farm Credit Administration, and the Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services.
SD–138

MAY 11

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior.
S–128, Capitol

MAY 12

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Federal Election Commission.
SR–301

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Corporation for National and Community Service.
SD–106

MAY 15

9:00 a.m.
Office of Technology Assessment Board meeting, to consider pending business.
EF–100, Capitol

MAY 17

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense, focusing on the Pacific Rim, NATO, and peacekeeping programs.
SD–192

MAY 19

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Veteran's Affairs, and the Selective Service System.
SD–106

MAY 20

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Departments of Veteran's Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and independent agencies.
SD–138

MAY 25

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of the Interior.
S–128, Capitol

MAY 26

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.
SD–106

JUNE 8

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Energy.
S–128, Capitol

JULY 19

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
Business meeting, to mark up proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 1995 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

CANCELLATIONS

APRIL 19

9:30 a.m.
Rules and Administration
To resume hearings on S. 1824, to improve the operations of the legislative branch of the Federal Branch, focusing on Subtitle A, Parts I and II of Title III, relating to Congressional biennial budgeting and additional budget process changes.
SR–301

2:30 p.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings to examine proposals to finance veterans health care reform.
SR-418

MAY 3

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings to review the implementation of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (Title 34 of P.L. 102-575) and the coordination of the program with other Federal protection and restoration efforts in the San Francisco Bay/Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.
SD-366

POSTPONEMENTS

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1995 for the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior.
S-128, Capitol