

I reserve my right to object to make that point. Now, apparently the leadership on this side has agreed not to object, and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to object, but I vigorously object to the actions that are being proposed to be taken tomorrow, and I will oppose those tomorrow. I will oppose them on the floor, and I will oppose them anywhere I can confront them. I hope to be joined by some of my friends on that side of the aisle.

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

Mr. HOYER. Further reserving the right to object, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Maryland. I know that he recalls that when action of this magnitude was taken in 1986, it was the result of 2 years of bipartisan effort to study the Federal retirement system, and they came up with a plan that fixed the Federal retirement system and, in fact, we are now taking in \$62.2 billion a year and paying out \$36 billion.

What is being attempted tomorrow is not an attempt to fix the retirement system. It is an attempt to accumulate \$12 billion in cuts in order to finance a tax cut for other Members on the backs of Federal employees who, in effect, would have to pay an increase, 12-percent increase, in their tax.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] withdraws his request.

TECHNICAL AMENDMENT TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 RELATING TO INDIAN EDUCATION

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the Senate bill (S. 377) to amend a provision of part A of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, relating to Indian education, to provide a technical amendment, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

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

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do not intend to object, but I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania so he may explain his unanimous-consent request.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I have asked unanimous consent to bring to the floor for consideration S. 377, legislation providing for a technical amendment to the Indian title of the Improving America's Schools Act. This legislation passed the Senate on a voice vote on February 16, 1995.

This bill, S. 377, would correct a drafting error to section 9112(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Edu-

cation Act relating to Indian education.

The intent of the House and Senate conferees was to require that a school would be eligible for an Indian Education Act formula grant if it had 20 eligible students or 25 percent of its student population eligible for the program. The provision was inadvertently drafted to replace the word "or" with "and".

The Department of Education is currently drafting regulations to implement the new provisions of the Indian Education Act. Unless this technical amendment is enacted by Congress, the existing language will result in disqualification of many schools serving American Indians and Alaska Natives, and I urge my colleagues to pass S. 377.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I rise in support of the unanimous-consent request and in support of this technical correction.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I object to being summarily sat down by the withdrawal. There are all sorts of things you can object to, I say to my good friend, the chairman of the committee, and he is my good friend.

I ask, under my reservation, does the gentleman intend to renew, and I would ask for a notice and the comity if you are going to renew the motion; you are not going to renew it because I happen to walk off the floor. We are not going to play that way, ladies and gentlemen.

Mr. GOODLING. If the gentleman will yield, that is not my responsibility to bring that to the floor nor is it my responsibility to remove it, nor is it my responsibility to bring it back again.

Mr. HOYER. Further reserving the right to object, I say to my good friend, he notices I was not looking at him at the time I said that.

Mr. GOODLING. I was merely going to say the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] seconds whatever it was you were saying in your reservation.

Mr. HOYER. I am sure the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA] would join me and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DAVIS] would join me and others would join me as well.

□ 1815

Mr. GOODLING. It was the gentleman's leadership that had signed off. That is why it was given to me to present.

Mr. HOYER. I understand that. So we will have some further discussions before it is moved ahead?

Mr. GOODLING. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. HOYER. Will my friend give me the assurance that this unanimous-consent request will not be renewed until such time as I have signed off on it?

Mr. GOODLING. If your leadership comes to us, I suppose we can give you some assurance.

Mr. HOYER. I take it that is a no.

Mr. GOODLING. I am not in a position to respond to the gentleman's request.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHAYS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

S. 377

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

SECTION 1. TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.

Section 9112(a)(1)(A) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (as added by section 101 of the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-382)) is amended by striking "and" and inserting "or".

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 377, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FEDERAL DISASTER RELIEF

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 39) expressing the sense of the Congress regarding Federal disaster relief, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to yield to the gentleman from Missouri to explain the request that is now before us.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, as Members know, we will soon consider fiscal year 1995 budget rescissions to pay for \$5.36 billion in emergency supplemental appropriations for last year's Northridge, CA, earthquake. Combined with the \$8.6 billion we appropriated last year, the cost to the Federal Government alone from this tragic disaster will be almost \$14 billion. It has now been reported as of yesterday that an additional \$2 billion in damages have occurred, with that number growing daily.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, to offer this resolution expressing the sense of the Congress to address the serious issue of reforming our Federal disaster policy, and I outline a number of measures that should be taken to reform our Federal disaster policy.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman for his fine explanation and I comment him for bringing this important issue before the House.

Everyone is familiar with our recent legacy of natural disasters. Hugo, Andrew, Iniki, Loma Prieta, Northridge. The names alone are sufficient to conjure images of death and destruction. But experts tell us that these are but a prelude to future events which could be even more catastrophic. Whether it be Missouri or Tennessee or Washington State or California, the point is that natural disasters are going to happen and it is our responsibility as homeowners, Government leaders, and as businessmen and women, to prepare for them.

To do that, a new partnership is urgently needed, so that more of the disaster relief burden can be borne by insurance and less by the Federal Government. That is what this resolution urges us to do, and that is the cornerstone of H.R. 2873, the Natural Disaster Protection Partnership Act, which I proposed in the last Congress.

That bill was the subject of hearings and wide-ranging discussions among homeowners, consumer groups, the insurance industry, realtors, labor unions, firefighters, and countless others.

What began as a modest proposal became, in the eyes of more than 160 of our colleagues, the nexus for solving the crisis facing millions of Americans affected by the likelihood of a natural disaster touching their lives.

Last September, the Public Works and Transportation Committee—which I had the privilege to chair—approved H.R. 2873 without opposition. We knew we couldn't get the bill enacted into law so close to the end of that Congress, but we also knew that we had to begin to force the issue and chip away at the apathy which says that we can worry about this crisis some other time. We can't.

This country simply must begin to stop the fear of what may come tomorrow, and we do that by forging a consensus where none has been possible in the past. That consensus is becoming possible because of the nature of the partnership proposed in H.R. 2873.

The partnership would lower the cost of coverage for natural disasters such as earthquakes, volcanic eruptions, and windstorms by spreading the financial risks and requiring that coverage in all policies.

We would enable homeowners to continue to rely on private insurance by creating two new funding backstops to cover the cost of claims which a State insurance pool or private insurance company could not cover on its own.

The first backstop would be a private, nongovernmental corporation. The corporation would become a reinsurance pool to be tapped into when either an insurance company or a State has reached the limits of its financial resources.

The second backstop would be a new Federal Disaster Trust Fund. This trust fund would provide short-term loans if the reinsurance pool is temporarily depleted.

And since we are talking about Federal loans, it is important to remember that this partnership would not increase the Federal deficit; the bill requires that the Treasury be reimbursed, with interest, after the crisis ends.

But more than these backstops, we would take actions up front, such as requiring States to adopt one of several model building codes, and the enforcement to go with it. What we all saw in Florida after Hurricane Andrew, for example, was a code which had not been enforced—and roofs that flew around the citrus State like flies in an orange grove. In other words, there must be a partnership in preventive medicine before disaster strikes as well as in financial surgery after the fact.

A bipartisan House Task Force on Natural Disasters—cochaired by the gentleman from Missouri whom, again, I want to commend for bringing vision and leadership to that effort—endorsed many of the principles embodied in H.R. 2873 when it issued its report last year.

Mr. Speaker, obviously, what was a Democratic leadership agenda in the 103d Congress is now Republican in the 104th. Legislation dealing with the Contract With America has preoccupied the House in these first 100 days.

Given this, the task force report in December, the reality of scores of new Members, the legislative schedule, and my own desire to tackle as many disaster insurance-related problems as possible in my legislation, I decided not to simply reintroduce the same bill that my committee approved last fall.

Working with the gentleman from Missouri, we are now looking at issues ranging from unfunded mandates to commercial losses.

Our goal is to get the legislation as right and as complete as possible so that we can do even better than the 162 cosponsors from last year, and quicken the pace from the time the bill is introduced to the time the House approves it.

I expect that the new legislation will be about 90 percent or more of what we reported last year, and that the bill will be ready in a few weeks.

House Concurrent Resolution 39, which I cosponsor, supports that effort. If it is the most we can do at this time to address the issue of preparing for natural disasters; it is the very least we must do.

As the resolution states, “* * * a fundamental overhaul of Federal disaster policies should be undertaken to reduce

costs to taxpayers and encourage more effective partnerships between private sector and government at all levels in anticipation of future catastrophes.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the resolution.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I just wish to take this time to thank the very distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MINETA] for his leadership in this subject area, both in the last Congress as the chairman of the then Public Works and Transportation Committee and for his leadership in this Congress as the ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and also the role that he played, most constructively, in the Bipartisan Task Force on Natural Disasters, which rendered, I think, a very fine bipartisan set of recommendations that will be transformed into legislative language using the gentleman's bill from the last Congress as a base. I hope, together with the gentleman, to move forward very expeditiously in this Congress with passage of this much needed legislation.

Mr. MINETA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Missouri, and I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 39

Whereas catastrophic natural disasters are occurring with greater frequency, a trend that is likely to continue for several decades according to prominent scientists;

Whereas the Federal Government has responded to disasters by appropriating relief funds, which provide only short-term assistance to victims but long-term burdens to tax-payers; and

Whereas the increasing reliance on Federal disaster relief has overshadowed the need to perform more comprehensive disaster planning and rely on private insurance for protection against disaster risks: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) persons who live in areas at high risk to natural disasters should assume more responsibility for their actions by insuring against such risks in order to minimize the rising cost of Federal disaster relief;

(2) sensible, cost-effective disaster mitigation programs should be encouraged and enhanced at the State and local level;

(3) insurers should create a privately funded pooling mechanism for the spreading of disaster risk in order to encourage the continued availability and affordability of private insurance in all parts of the Nation; and

(4) a fundamental overhaul of Federal disaster policies should be undertaken to reduce costs to tax-payers and encourage more effective partnerships between the private sector and government at all levels in anticipation of future catastrophes.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 39; the concurrent resolution just agreed to.

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

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR CIRCUS ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure be discharged from further consideration of the current resolution—House Concurrent Resolution 34—authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus anniversary commemoration, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development, for an explanation of his request.

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

Mr. Speaker, this resolution merely authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for a brief performance of the Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus on or about April 3, 1995. This event is intended to be a salute to the 104th Congress and a celebration of the 125th anniversary of the Ringling Brothers Circus. This event promises to be a welcomed diversion for Members, their families, staff, and the general public, and will be free of charge. It will feature traditional circus entertainment, complete with recorded music.

Ringling Brothers will assume all expenses and liabilities in connection with this event, which will be presented under conditions prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board. These officials are currently meeting to discuss the details of this event.

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's expla-

nation, and I too support this resolution. The circus provides family entertainment for millions of Americans and families, and we are pleased to be able to be a part of this annual event and bring it to the Capitol Grounds for this salute to the 104th Congress.

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

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 34

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus celebrates its 125th year on April 10, 1995, during its engagement in our Nation's Capital;

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus represents a 200-year tradition of circus in America;

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus demonstrates to children of all ages that humans and animals can work together in harmony and cooperation; and

Whereas Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus is committed to its goal of educating the people of the United States as to the need to conserve endangered species: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR RINGLING BROS. AND BARNUM & BAILEY CIRCUS ANNIVERSARY COMMEMORATION.

Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus (hereinafter in this resolution referred to as "Ringling Bros.") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, with circus elephants and performers, on the Capitol Grounds on April 3, 1995, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that Ringling Bros. shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, Ringling Bros. is authorized to erect upon the Capitol grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON REPRESENTATIONS.

Ringling Bros. shall not represent, either directly or indirectly, that this resolution or any activity carried out under this resolution in any way constitutes approval or endorsement by the Federal Government of Ringling Bros. or any product or service offered by Ringling Bros.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to consider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just adopted.

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

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

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

[Mr. GUTIERREZ addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. BATEMAN addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the minority side will still yet have a unanimous-consent request to make, and if we go into the special orders, will that be too late for them to do so? I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] is checking on that now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would state that normally business requests are not entertained once special orders have begun.

□ 1830

RENEWAL OF REQUEST FOR PERMISSION FOR CERTAIN COMMITTEES AND SUBCOMMITTEES TO SIT ON TOMORROW DURING THE 5-MINUTE RULE

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following committees and subcommittees be able to sit during the 5-minute rule tomorrow: Committee on Banking and Financial Services, Committee on Commerce, Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Committee