



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 143

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 18, 1997

No. 85

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m.

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

We recognize, O gracious God, that the burden of responsibility to support and defend the good traditions of this land is the concern of every person. Help us, in our assignments, to focus on what unites us, enable us to see more clearly those concerns that we share, may we be more articulate about those gifts of freedom and liberty for which we are custodians, and give us the vision to remember to be good stewards of the heritage that we have together. May we never settle for the good when we can do better, or give in to winning arguments instead of promoting justice and mercy. Lift our sights, O God, to see what truly makes us human so that we will be the people You would have us be and do those good things that honor You and serve this Nation with dignity and grace. In Your name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. TIAHRT. 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. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. HEFLEY 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.

AMERICA DESERVES A RAISE

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, "America deserves a raise." That is a slogan I quite agree with. I have a proposal that will give millions of taxpayers exactly that. It is called tax cuts. This is a method that probably has never occurred to those who coined the slogan, "America deserves a raise," but tax cuts are the best way to give taxpayers a raise.

Now, of course, the politicians really would not be giving anybody anything. The money people earn is already theirs to begin with. Government would only be letting them keep more of what they work so very hard to get.

Mr. Speaker, taxpayers do deserve a break. They should be able to keep more of their own money. They would then have the power to live their lives as they see fit, more freedom to realize their dreams, to build for the future and to provide for themselves and their families.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, America deserves a raise.

ARROGANT POLITICAL ACTS RESULT IN STAGNATION AND NON-ACTION

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

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, for the last 4 months a bipartisan task force on ethics reform has been meeting. Yesterday the 12 Members of that task force voted out its final recommendations with only one dissent, the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS]. All the Democrats voted for it and all but Mr. THOMAS on the Republican side. We set a public hearing for Friday and we were directing to have the matter voted on on the floor next week, perhaps as early as Tuesday.

Late last night we were informed that the Republican leadership of the House of Representatives had fired the task force, canceled the public hearing, and would not have the bipartisan work of the task force considered on the floor next week. This is the most arrogant political act since the Saturday Night Massacre, when Richard Nixon fired Archibald Cox 24 years ago.

We, as a bipartisan group, had agreed upon ways to reform the ethics task force with all the Republicans except one supporting that, and then we were fired by the Republican leadership last night and told we may not proceed to amend the ethics procedures of this House. This is unacceptable.

TAX REDUCTIONS SOON A REALITY FOR AMERICANS

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

Mr. NEUMANN. Mr. Speaker, in the great State of Wisconsin, Governor Tommy Thompson has provided the people of Wisconsin with tax reductions and maintained a balanced budget, and that is what we are about to do out here in Washington, DC.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H3867

We are on the verge of finishing our commitment to the American people. We are already in the third year of our plan to balance the budget, the third year of a 7-year plan to balance the budget; we are way ahead of schedule, and we are now about to provide the American people with tax reductions.

What does that mean to a family in Janesville, WI? They have three kids, one headed off to college, and they are going to get help paying the college tuition to the tune of \$1,500. For the other kids that are still home in that family, they are going to get another \$1,000 on top of that.

The tax cuts are being provided at the same time we fulfill our commitment to the American people to balance the Federal budget so that our children in this great country can look forward to a sound financial future and opportunities to live the American dream that we have had.

BALANCE THE BUDGET WITH DISCIPLINE

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

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, the tax bill crafted by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] has some good items in it. Every American would like to have a tax cut, whether it be an income or estate or a capital gains tax. But I am beginning to fear that we are losing sight of the ball, that we originally came here in the early 1990's to balance the budget.

When President Clinton was elected in 1992 we had a deficit of \$290 billion. This year that deficit is expected to be \$57 billion. What are we seeing now? We are seeing an unfair tax bill that may be passed by this House that will make the tax cuts so large that we will not have that balanced budget, maybe not even by 2002.

Let us pass a reasonable tax cut that treats parents and college students fairly, working parents fairly, and even investors. But let us not lose sight of the ball to balance that budget as soon as we can.

DEMOCRATS' CURIOUS DEFINITION OF INCOME

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

Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, here is a riddle that is very confusing to Americans: How does your \$35,000 income turn into an income of \$75,600? Answer: When liberal Democrats are doing the counting.

According to the Census Bureau, 71 percent of the tax cuts from the Republican tax bill will go to people who earn between \$20,000 and \$75,000 a year. However, the administration says that over 77 percent of the tax cuts will go to people earning more than \$75,000 a year.

Who is right? Well, one has to understand that the administration figures what one earns does not count; what the administration counts is one's family economic income.

Note: Say your family's income is \$35,000. To that one will have to add, according to the administration, \$18,000 for the rent one could get if one did not live in his house; \$5,500 for the family health insurance his employer provides; \$3,000 for the buildup in his pension; \$2,000 a year for one's IRA contribution; \$1,500 for the buildup of one's life insurance policy; \$600 for one's parking space at work, and it goes on and on until your income is \$75,600. The administration's tax books are cooked.

COMMON SENSE FOR CONGRESS

(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, the White House says that the Republicans help the rich and hurt the poor. From taxes to disaster aid, let there be no mistake: The White House is winning.

But I ask at what expense? Rich versus poor, black versus white, man versus woman, old versus young. Politics of class, politics of race, the politics of fear, the politics of division. Yes, the White House is winning. The White House is winning the political spin battle, but I say to the Congress, unless both parties start to use some common sense and stop cannibalizing one another, the American people will lose this war. All of them. Any party that is that bad would never get elected.

TAX RELIEF FOR THE MIDDLE CLASS

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, has anyone noticed that any tax cut proposal made by Republicans is reflexively labeled tax cuts for the wealthy by the liberal Democrats. Given that the tax cuts in the balanced budget amendment are targeted at middle class taxpayers, I interpret this strange reaction in one of two ways: It means that either they think middle class taxpayers are rich, which must be news to a lot of middle class people who live very modestly, or it means that they really do not like the idea of tax cuts at all, because it means that big government programs cannot expand as fast as they want.

Of course, there could be other interpretations. It could simply reflect the confusion so common among liberal Democrats about whether tax money already belongs to the taxpayers who earned it, or whether the tax money actually belongs to the politicians who then spend it in Washington in ways designated to get themselves reelected. It could also be plain old fashioned envy, a favorite tool of liberals. What-

ever it is, such nonsense should be ignored and the middle class should get tax relief.

EQUITABLE TAX RELIEF FOR AMERICANS

(Ms. KILPATRICK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I first want to offer and ask the Nation to pray for Dr. Betty Shabazz who continues to be blessed and sick in a New York hospital.

I also want to talk about the tax cuts that are before this House of Representatives and this Congress. We all want a tax cut. Democrats want a tax cut. We want the tax cuts to go to the people who most need it, those middle income people who work every day, who take care of their families, who want to send their children to school, and who make under \$40,000 a year.

We want a tax cut. We want it equitable. We want our children to be able to grow and to learn.

So as this House addresses the tax situation and the cut that will be had by Americans around this country, let us not forget the families, the children, the people who work every day to take care of their children. Let them have the tax cut, those that make \$40,000 and less.

CONFUSION ABOUT GIVING AND TAKING

(Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a lot of confusion on the other side of the aisle about who is giving and who is taking. I am talking, of course, about those of my colleagues who believe this liberal baloney about giving, giving the people that which already belongs to them.

Not a day passes in Washington without the left wing of Congress mindlessly repeating something that I hold to be blatantly false, that the politicians are giving anybody a tax break. Only in Washington do people define taking a little less to somehow be giving.

Now, the wealthy, who give the most, sometimes hundreds of times more than anybody else, are not taking from anyone. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is the key to the liberals' failure to understand this issue. Every time Tiger Woods wins another tournament or Bill Gates brings about another software innovation to the marketplace, or a farmer in Colorado buys another section, no one is worse off by their achievements.

Government takes from them, not the other way around. The term "tax cuts for the rich" is just another liberal euphemism for their genuine belief that the fruits of their labor does not really belong to them, and that these politicians in Washington should have greater claim to it than they do.

**ETHICS REFORM TASK FORCE
DISSOLVED**

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

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to learn that Speaker GINGRICH had suddenly dissolved the ethics task force, and this Tuesday night massacre I hope does not effectively end bipartisan ethics reform.

After 4 months of work, a bipartisan task force voted 11 to 1 in support of an ethics reform package, but none of us will ever see the fruits of their labor, just hours before it issued its report. While the task force reviewed the rules and made its recommendations, both Democrats and Republicans agreed to a 6-month moratorium on all ethics complaints.

□ 1015

Now it appears that the entire process was merely a political device to shield Members from ethics complaints and to delay investigations. Speaker GINGRICH is the last person who should be thwarting ethics reform. He should not have the final word on this. He should allow the task force to issue its report, and allow the House to vote on this bipartisan reform proposal.

**AMERICANS DESERVE A TAX
BREAK TODAY**

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

MR. TIAHRT. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the advertising phrase "You deserve a break today." Americans deserve a tax break today. It has been 16 years since Americans have had any tax relief. In fact, we have suffered through the two largest tax increases in history in just the last half decade. Working families deserve a tax break, \$500 per child tax relief, reduction in capital gains, reduction in death taxes, credits for investing in college. It all boils down to more freedom. It includes more control of your money, and it means stoking our economy, making more money available for investments. That means more jobs.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, America does deserve a tax break today.

**THE REPUBLICAN COMPANY
STORE**

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

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, in the last Congress we had a debate about minimum wage. There were many people in the Republican leadership that got up and took the well and said that they were opposed to increasing the minimum wage. It caused me at that point to muse that somewhere between Abraham Lincoln and NEWT GINGRICH the

Republican Party had changed its opinion of slavery.

Eventually we decided in a bipartisan fashion to give America's lowest paid workers a raise. We increased the minimum wage. Now as we are in the process of getting some 1 million people from welfare into workfare by a time certain, the Republicans have changed their mind again. They have decided that slave labor guaranteed by the Federal Government is all right, that those people that we are moving from welfare to workfare should not be paid a minimum wage.

We are time-limiting their welfare benefits, forcing them into the work force but not guaranteeing them a minimum wage. Thus we are trapping those same people economically. This really is a Republican version of the old company store, when at the end of the year the workers owed the company store more than they had paid; so what we are telling these people is: At the end of the year, you will owe us for the benefit we gave you of being able to work.

To the Republicans I say, "Get real."

**URGING MEMBERS NOT TO WASTE
THEIR VOTE ON H.R. 1270**

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I have been in this well many times to discuss the facts surrounding the nuclear waste debate. I have largely concentrated on the issues of transporting nuclear waste across this Nation's highways and rail system. Over and over I have stressed that there are very real safety issues that must be addressed and resolved before we as legislators mandate a life-threatening policy on the American people who live in our districts.

To further illustrate my point, Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a recent mishap. On May 22 of this year an unexpected pressure buildup forced the top off a large metal shipping container at the U.S. DOE's Fernau site near Cincinnati, OH. The container held five 55-gallon drums of radioactive waste. This happened to a container that was a stationary container, not in the transport arena. If these caps are this unsafe, how can we pass a bill that would endanger the lives of every citizen in this country? I urge Members not to waste their vote on H.R. 1270.

**NO JUSTICE OR FAIRNESS IN THE
REPUBLICAN TAX BILL**

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

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Speaker, the Scripture tells us or asks us, "What then is required of us but to do justice, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God?"

Mr. Speaker, there is very little justice in the Republican tax plan that is going to be presented to this House. According to the Treasury Department, the vast majority of the tax cuts in the Republican bill would go to the wealthiest of Americans. Specifically, the Treasury Department information tells us that two-thirds of the Republican tax cuts would benefit families with incomes of over \$100,000 per year. The richest 1 percent would receive an average tax break of over \$12,000. Not many of my constituents earn \$100,000 a year. There is no justice, no fairness, in the Republican tax bill. We need tax relief for America's working families.

**SUPPORT INCREASED FUNDING
FOR FEDERAL TRIO PROGRAMS**

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

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I extend my prayers to Dr. Shabazz in her recovery in New York.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I rise because yesterday the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Training, and Life-long Learning of the Committee on Education and the Workforce held a hearing on the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act.

For over 30 years this act has provided postsecondary education opportunities for millions of Americans. This is a shining example of providing national leadership and resources to help educate all Americans. In the hearing yesterday they reviewed Federal TRIO programs. TRIO provides academic counseling and outreach to students from families who earn less than \$25,000 a year. It helps students who would not otherwise receive postsecondary education by giving them a chance and giving them an opportunity.

TRIO, Mr. Speaker, is making a difference. A 1993 study by the Department of Education found that TRIO is extremely effective at counseling young people in their elementary and secondary school years, for it is based on the Jeffersonian principle that education should be provided to those who have an ability to learn and not just an ability to pay.

Recently released results of the Third International Math and Science Study found that American third and fourth graders, Mr. Speaker, rank highest in math and science worldwide. Let us give TRIO a chance. Refund it, and allow us the opportunity to train those eighth-graders when their scores dropped.

**A WARNING TO AMERICANS: THE
PRESIDENT HAS BROKEN HIS
WORD**

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to warn the working men and women of this country that the President has broken his word. He says he is going to veto a tax bill that contains exactly what he agreed to, badly needed tax relief for families and children.

Through his spokesman, the President says he will not sign a tax bill that contains a \$500-per-child tax credit, estate tax relief, and a capital gains reduction. I am outraged, first, that he would once again break his word, and second, that no one is holding him accountable. Every American who is faced with high taxes deserves an explanation. It is time for the President to quit playing games.

Mr. President, honor your commitment. America needs tax relief now.

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO GUARANTEE TAX FAIRNESS

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

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, the hallmark of any tax system has to be fairness and justice. No system of taxation, particularly in a republic like ours, can be supported if it is not fair and just. What the majority here in this House is trying to do is to perpetrate on the people of this country a system of taxation which is neither fair nor just.

The best example of that in the recent bill that they have proposed is a proposal to eliminate the alternative minimum tax. The alternative minimum tax was established back in 1986, when it was discovered that major American corporations with huge profits were paying absolutely no taxes to the Federal Government.

On one occasion, for example, a major American corporation, in spite of the fact that it had \$5.5 billion in profits, paid no taxes to the Federal Government whatsoever, while the average taxpayer in my State, for example, was paying \$34,000 of their hard-earned money in taxes that year. Obviously if we reduce the taxes for major corporations, others are going to have to make up the difference. That difference will have to be made up by the American working people.

I am going to introduce a resolution supporting the alternative minimum tax and an amendment to the bill when it comes on this floor to make sure that profitable corporations pay their share of taxes.

INTRODUCTION OF H.R. 1813, PER- SONAL INFORMATION PRIVACY ACT

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

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to point out how our children's

privacy is being violated. Last week the Wall Street Journal told how a jelly bean manufacturer uses its Web site to pump kids for personal information.

Lured by a free sample of jelly beans, children are asked to give this company their name, address, gender, age, and where they shop. The fine print disclaimer states that any information disclosed is the property of the candy maker to use any way it wants.

Jelly bean makers are not the only ones taking advantage of our children on the Net. Other on-line sites frequently require children to fill out questionnaires about themselves, their friends, and their family. This practice of prodding children for information on the Web is not only unethical, it is also dangerous. Not only can marketers use this information to further prey on our children, but it also leaves children vulnerable to wrongdoers who can victimize them.

The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. BOB FRANKS, and I have introduced H.R. 1813, the Personal Information Privacy Act, that would keep critical information about children and their families from becoming fodder for marketers and potential wrongdoers. I urge my colleagues to become a sponsor of H.R. 1813.

PROBLEMS WITH THE CHILD CREDIT

(Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, this summer during the Presidential election, everyone, Republicans, Democrats, promised the American people a child credit. We certainly should keep that promise. However, when we look at the bill that has passed out of the Committee on Ways and Means, the promise is not kept for many people. Working families can lose a child credit if they have day care expenses. What a message to send out to the 70 percent of working parents, two-parent families, with young children.

Average families can lose both the child credit and the educational credit because they are thrown into the alternative minimum tax, a great complication in the tax system, but one that was put in there to make sure very well-off families did not zero out, certainly not to get a complicated tax form for people with children.

Here we look at the bill. Poor families cannot get the child credit because they do not earn enough money. Hard-working families with children will see their credit disappear before their eyes because they are using the education credit or the child credit. Then we look at wealthy families, and they do not get it because they earn too much money. We agreed on a child credit. We should go back and do it right. Americans need that \$500. Americans need that tax credit.

MIDDLE-CLASS AMERICANS ARE ASKING: WHO IS ON MY SIDE?

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

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, as this body begins to implement the balanced budget agreement, working middle-class Americans are asking themselves one simple question: Who is on my side?

The Republicans' tax proposal makes clear who their party is looking out for: big business and the wealthy; for under the Republican bill over half the tax benefits go to the top 5 percent of Americans, those making over \$250,000 a year.

In addition, they are giving \$22 million in new tax breaks to big business by phasing out the alternative minimum tax, which was supposed to ensure that even big corporations pay some taxes every year, the way hard-working middle Americans pay their taxes every year. But Mr. Speaker, this is wrong for these corporations to be able to limit their tax obligation. We need to provide tax relief to those families who really can use it, hard-working middle-class American families.

The Democrats have proposed a tax cut package whose benefits are targeted to these families, families struggling to make ends meet, to put food on the table, with enough left over to pay for health care for their kids. We are on your side.

CHINA'S SALE OF MISSILES TO IRAN

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

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for the debate and the vote on most-favored-nation status for China, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues a statement made by Secretary William Cohen yesterday in which he said that Iran this month successfully tested a new air-launched antiship cruise missile obtained from China.

□ 1030

A Member should have serious concerns about China's proliferation behavior to Iran. We spend a great deal of time, money, and effort to promote the Middle East peace, and Iran is a menace to that peace.

I would like to also call to the attention of my colleagues the statement by the Office of Naval Intelligence: Discoveries after the Gulf war clearly indicate that Iraq maintained an aggressive weapons of mass destruction procurement program. A similar situation exists today in Iran with a steady flow of materials and technologies from China to Iran.

This exchange is one of the most active weapons of mass destruction programs in the Third World and is taking

place in a region of great strategic interest to the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this is also a place where our young people are in harm's way in the Persian Gulf. I urge my colleagues to seriously attend to the issue of proliferation as they decide on their vote and vote no on most-favored-nation status to China.

AVAILABILITY OF CLASSIFIED ANNEX AND SCHEDULE OF AUTHORIZATIONS FOR REVIEW BY MEMBERS

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to announce to all Members of the House that the permanent select committee has ordered H.R. 1775, the Intelligence Authorization Act for fiscal year 1998, reported to the House. That report was filed this morning.

I would also like to announce that the classified annex and the classified schedule of authorizations accompanying H.R. 1775 are available for review by Members at the offices of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence in room H-405 of the Capitol. The committee office will be open during regular business hours for the convenience of any Member who wishes to review this material prior to its consideration by the House. It is my understanding that H.R. 1775 will be considered on the floor the week we return from the Independence Day recess.

I would recommend that Members wishing to review the classified annex contact the committee's director of security to arrange a time and date for that viewing. This will assure the availability of committee staff to assist Members who desire that assistance during the review of the classified materials. I urge Members to take some time to review these classified documents before the bill is brought to the floor in order to better understand the recommendations of the committee.

The classified annex to the committee's report contains the intelligence committee's recommendations to the intelligence budget for fiscal year 1998 and related classified information that may not be disclosed publicly but which Members are entitled to.

It is important that Members keep in mind the requirements of clause 13 of rule XLIII of the House adopted at the beginning of the 104th Congress. That rule only permits access to classified information by those Members of the House who have signed the oath set out in rule XLIII.

For Members who wish further instruction on rule XLIII and the oath, they can also call the intelligence office.

NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1997

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 164 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 164

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 1(b) of rule XXIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 437) to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour, with forty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources and twenty minutes equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. In lieu of the amendment recommended by the Committee on Science now printed in the bill, it shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 1 pursuant to clause 6 of rule XXIII. Each section of that amendment shall be considered as read. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the amendment in the nature of a substitute made in order as original text. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROGAN). The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOAKLEY], my friend, ranking member, former distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is straightforward, fair, was reported without dissent by the Committee on Rules. Under House Resolution 164, any Member seeking to improve the bill by offering a germane amendment may do so. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate, 40 minutes equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Resources and 20 minutes afforded to their counterparts from the Committee on Science, as we heard from the reading from the Clerk.

The rule also reconciles a slight difference between those committees by

considering an amendment in the nature of a substitute as the base text for consideration. It is a sensible process that allows us to consider the bill in a timely fashion without restricting the rights of the minority or individual Members, the deliberative process at work in the people's House.

H.R. 437 reauthorizes the National Sea Grant College Program. This program leverages a small Federal investment of approximately 50 million a year which is matched by nonfederal funds to over 300 sea grant institutions and affiliated schools throughout our Nation. Located at the Nation's premier research universities, sea grant focuses the skills of hundreds of researchers on issues affecting the development and use of our marine and coastal resources. It is a program that is working.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of H.R. 437, especially as a Representative from the great State of Florida and its wonderful coastline and beaches. I am particularly pleased that my home State of Florida is a leading participant in the program. All nine of our State universities are involved in sea grant activities, along with several private universities and marine research laboratories. Sea grant provides a good example of the national benefits that can come with local investment. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this wide-open fair rule that makes this important bill in order.

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

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

I thank my colleague and dear friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], for yielding me the customary half hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this open rule. It is a very, very good program. The National Sea Grants College Act was created 30 years ago to improve the marine resource conservation management and use. Since that time, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. sea grants have provided our country with priceless information about our marine resources, how best to conserve them, how best to use them.

This marine science is not only limited to ocean life, Mr. Speaker. It includes our coastal and Great Lakes areas as well.

Today there are over 300 sea grant institutions, two of which are in my home State of Massachusetts: the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Woods Hole. Woods Hole has been a national leader in marine biotechnology research for many years. And Massachusetts Institute of Technology has been a leading participant in sea grant programs since 1969.

Today they are researching the northern right whale. This is an endangered species whose last natural habitat is in the Stellwagon Bank. Unfortunately, something in the environment is changing the whale's breeding patterns and causing great concern not

only to the whales but to humans as well.

Massachusetts Institute of Technology is currently trying to find out what is happening in the whales' environment and how we can fix it. Their research really comes none too soon until there are only about 250 right whales living today. Massachusetts Institute of Technology is also working with Massachusetts Water Resource Authority to study the contaminants in Boston Harbor and what effect they have on shellfish and other marine life indigenous to our area.

So I urge my colleagues to support this bill. It provides for continued success in a great program which helps us protect and better understand our marine resources.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that we both share, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts and myself, appreciation for this program. I have been to Woods Hole many times and applaud what a marvelous facility it is, and I invite the gentleman to come to Florida to some of our facilities. I know that he will have equal respect for them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

I have also been to Woods Hole, and I also invite this group to the Chesapeake Bay to see how the sea grant program operates.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I support the open rule guiding the consideration of the reauthorization of the National Sea Grant college program, and I support the bill H.R. 437. I want to commend my colleagues on the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources for working out a compromise version of H.R. 437 that deserves the support of the entire House of representatives.

Sea grant is a program that enables us to understand how our complex coastal and marine environments function, to develop novel ways to benefit from our marine resources without overexploiting them and to extend and communicate the benefits of scientific ocean research to our Nation's citizens.

In my own State of Maryland, sea grant efforts have played an important role in understanding, protecting and restoring the Chesapeake Bay. I will give one example. Sea grant researchers in Maryland, Virginia, Delaware and North Carolina have detailed over the last decade through competitively funded research the life cycle of the blue crab. Their findings about the blue crab are already proving helpful in understanding threats to the last great Chesapeake Bay fishery, and they will enable us to develop sound strategies to protect this renowned resource.

In addition, sea grant leads the Nation in its support for peer reviewed

fundamental discovery in marine biotechnology in our Nation's research institutions. Marine biotechnology research shows great promise to help this Nation develop new industries of enormous economic potential.

Sea grant also extends the results of that research to users through sea grant's educational and outreach efforts. For example, the Maryland sea grant extension program is administered by and works closely with the Cooperative Extension Service to advance aquaculture, improve environmental decisionmaking and provide citizens with information needed for nonregulatory protection of our natural resources.

Maryland sea grant educational activities provide research experiences for undergraduates, help instruct K through 12 students in environmental science and biotechnology, and translate complex scientific information into terms useful for the average citizen.

As a member of the Committee on Science and a cosponsor of this excellent bill, I am in full support of this reauthorization, which balances fiscal responsibility with the protection of important programs that work for the good of our Nation.

I commend the author of this bill, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the chairs of my Committee on Science, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] and the chair of the Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], along with the staffs of both committees for their efforts to preserve and improve this valuable program.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the rule and H.R. 437, a bill that is good for the environment, good for education and supportive of sound scientific solutions for the preservation of our Nation's marine resources.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I did visit the State of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GOSS], and I had great delight in seeing Shamu down there.

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

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the communication from the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts. I want to explain to him that he has experienced just the beginning. There is so much more than Shamu, but that is a good start.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1045

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Pursuant to House Resolution 164 and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union

for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 437.

□ 1045

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 437) to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes, with Mr. ROGAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] each will control 20 minutes; and the gentleman from Wisconsin, [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER] each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON].

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 437, a bill to reauthorize the Sea Grant College Program. I introduced H.R. 437 on January 9 of this year. The bill was referred to the Committee on Resources and then to the Subcommittees on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, which I chair.

I am pleased that the bill has the bipartisan support of 107 cosponsors, including the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Committee on Resources; the gentleman from California, Mr. GEORGE MILLER, the ranking Democrat; and the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, my good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii, Mr. NEIL ABERCROMBIE.

I would also like to thank at this point the members of the Committee on Science, particularly the chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] who, incidentally, celebrated his 29th birthday just 4 days ago, and we wish him every happiness in his 30th year on this planet.

The gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] was also very helpful.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's calculator is a little bit off, but we will excuse him for that.

Mr. SAXTON. Well, Mr. Chairman, we wish the gentleman a happy, happy birthday, anyway.

I would also like to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT] for his able assistance as a member of the Committee on Science during this process.

H.R. 437 was reported to the Committee on Resources on March 12 and an amended version of the bill was reported by the Committee on Science, which I just mentioned, on April 22.

The committees have subsequently reached agreement on a compromise text, which is the vehicle before the House today.

The National Sea Grant College Program was established by Congress in 1966 to improve our Nation's marine resource conservation efforts, to better manage those resources, and to enhance their proper utilization.

H.R. 437, the National Sea Grant College Program Reauthorization Act of 1997, authorizes funding for Sea Grant through fiscal year 2000; simplifies the definition of issues under Sea Grant's authority; clarifies the responsibilities of State and national programs; consolidates and clarifies the requirements for the designation of Sea Grant colleges and regional groups; repeals an international program that has never been funded; prohibits lobbying with Federal funds, and assures that Sea Grant research will be adequately peer reviewed.

By enacting this legislation we will be sending a clear message supporting the conservation and research-based management of our marine and coastal resources. I urge all Members to support the bill.

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

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume and I rise in strong support of the bill.

However, I would like to add that, hopefully, the funding for Sea Grant, the funding numbers for the Sea Grant proposal here, are more accurate than those recently assigned to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER]. This represents a compromise, Mr. Chairman. Perhaps those numbers the gentleman from Wisconsin had assigned to him by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] also represent a compromise.

But this represents a compromise, Mr. Chairman, between the Committee on Resources and the Committee on Science, which shares jurisdiction with the Committee on Resources over the research component of Sea Grant.

The bill reauthorizes the National Sea Grant College Program, which for over 30 years has addressed important local, regional, and national marine resource management problems through education, research, and public outreach.

The compromise text, Mr. Chairman, reauthorizes Sea Grant for 3 years. It clarifies the roles of the national office and the Sea Grant colleges. It strengthens competitive peer review, as the gentleman from New Jersey mentioned, particularly for grants and contracts for research, education and outreach, and generally brings Sea Grant up to date as a modern education and research program.

The authorization levels in the bill will force some belt-tightening at the national Sea Grant office but will provide for modest growth in funding for programs and projects carried out by

the Sea Grant colleges themselves. These activities are the heart and soul of the Sea Grant Program and are parts of the program that must be preserved, especially in difficult budget times.

Since 1968, speaking from personal experience, Mr. Chairman, the University of Hawaii's Sea Grant College Program has been a useful resource in the areas of aquaculture, marine biotechnology, coastal processes, coastal pollution and reef ecology. In the State of Hawaii marine resources are vital. Hawaii's coastal resources, which are world-renowned tourist attractions, generate nearly 40 percent of our gross State product. The value of our coastal resources is dependent on their health and beauty.

I want to express my appreciation for the cooperation the minority has received from the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and their staffs. H.R. 437 is not really a bipartisan bill, Mr. Chairman, it is a non-partisan bill. I think all of us who represent coastal areas have long appreciated the benefits of this practical, noncontroversial program.

We would have been on the floor nearly 2 years ago reauthorizing this popular and pragmatic program if ideology had not interfered. On that note, I appreciate the cooperation extended by the leadership of the Committee on Science in the person of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] and his staff in working out this compromise. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the work, in addition, of my good friend, whom I had the pleasure of working with in a previous committee, the Minerals Subcommittee, the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT].

I hope this new spirit of cooperation leads to more timely authorization of marine research and oceanography programs, which are so vital not only to this Nation but to the planet, Mr. Chairman, over which the two committees share jurisdiction. This is a good start on a very good bill reauthorizing a popular program. I urge the House and all of our colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 437, the National Sea Grant College Reauthorization Act of 1997. This legislation reflects a cooperative effort between the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources to craft a Sea Grant reauthorization bill that is in the best interest of the program and of the taxpayers. I believe that the product of that effort, the amendment in the nature of a substitute to H.R. 437 brought by the gentleman from New Jersey, achieves these goals, and I urge bipartisan support.

This amendment is a 3-year reauthorization that adds or modifies various

definitions, clarifies the duties of the program director, sets forth the duties of the Sea Grant institutions and certain types of entities conducting Sea Grant programs. The amendment includes merit reviews of grant and contract applications, repeals the Sea Grant International Program, which has never been funded, and reauthorizes the Sea Grant program at \$54.3 million for fiscal year 1998, \$55.4 million for fiscal year 1999, and \$56.5 million for fiscal year 2000. It also authorizes, within these amounts for each fiscal year, up to \$2.8 million for competitive grants for university research on the zebra mussel and up to \$2.0 million for oyster disease research.

The amendment also promotes efficiency and to ensure that the taxpayers' money is spent on research and not on bureaucracy. It limits administrative spending to no more than 5 percent of the lesser of the amount authorized or appropriated each fiscal year, and clarifies that the maximum pay for voting members of the Sea Grant Board is determined by the Secretary of Commerce.

Finally, the amendment prohibits the use of Sea Grant funds for lobbying, and requires the Secretary of Commerce notice the Committees on Science and Resources of any reprogramming of Sea Grant funds or reorganization of any Sea Grant program, project or activity.

I believe the Committees on Science and Resources have crafted a non-controversial bill that is good for the Sea Grant Program and good for the taxpayers, and urge my colleagues to support it.

In closing, I wish to thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT], the chairman of the Committee on Science's Subcommittee on Energy and Environment, and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], the subcommittee's ranking member, for their hard work on this legislation.

I would also like to thank the Committee on Science's ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN] for his bipartisan support.

I also want to commend the efforts of the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Committee on Resources; the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], ranking member of the Committee on Resources; my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], chairman of the Resources Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans; and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], the subcommittee's ranking member, even though the calculator in the Committee on Resources on my age is way off, and I excuse them for that.

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the House has a chance today to pass H.R. 437, to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program. The Sea Grant

program was established by Congress in 1966 and has contributed much to the marine sciences over the past 30 years.

The nationwide Sea Grant network is composed of 26 Sea Grant colleges which act as centers for the participation of over 300 universities from both coastal and inland States. The Sea Grant focus on research, education, technology transfer and public service makes this a unique program with a long record of accomplishment.

In 1994, the National Academy of Sciences conducted an indepth review of the Sea Grant program and said, and I quote, "Sea Grant has been virtually the only source of funding in the United States for activities in marine policy and has been a major contributor for the fields of marine aquaculture, coastal and estuarine research, marine fisheries management, seafood safety, marine biotechnology, marine engineering, and marine technology development."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the leadership of both the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources for working out an agreement on Sea Grant reauthorization. It is clear that the Sea Grant Program has always enjoyed strong congressional support from both sides of the aisle and from all of the committees that have jurisdiction.

The administration has requested funding for the basic Sea Grant Program but has continued to propose the termination of one project of great importance to many Members of Congress who live in the Great Lakes region. I refer to the zebra mussel research program that has been carried out by some of the Sea Grant colleges.

The zebra mussel was first sighted in 1988 and has rapidly spread throughout all of the Great Lakes, the Hudson River, the Saint Lawrence River, and much of the Mississippi Basin. The zebra mussel infestation has assumed nightmarish proportions and has affected electric power generation, industrial water intake facilities, fishing, recreational uses of waterways and beaches, and, Mr. Chairman, agriculture.

A female zebra mussel can lay up to 1 million eggs per year, of which more than 5 percent will survive.

□ 1100

They live up to 5 years and can colonize in a density of 10,000 mussels per square yard. There are no known predators, and we lack any real understanding of what control strategies have any chance of success.

Mr. Chairman, when the committee held hearings on the Sea Grant Program, we discussed at length the shortsighted decision of the administration to propose no funding for zebra mussel and other invasive species research. Indeed, James Baker, the Administrator of NOAA, agreed with us that this is a serious problem in need of Federal attention.

A number of members of the committee, some of whom will speak today,

wrote a letter to the administration emphasizing our desire to see this research funded. Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD that letter.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, RAYBURN
HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING,

Washington, DC, March 19, 1997.

Hon. D. JAMES BAKER,
*Under Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere,
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR DR. BAKER: We would like to express our strong support for continued funding for Zebra Mussel research that has been included in H.R. 475, the Marine Research Revitalization Act of 1987. The impact of Zebra Mussel infestation has spread far beyond the Great Lakes and now stands to threaten waterways nationwide.

Your testimony before the Subcommittee affirmed the vital importance of this problem. It is critical that control strategies and eradication methods be fully explored on an expeditious basis.

It is our intent to support funding for this program and we look forward to working with you in ensuring that this research is vigorously pursued over the next several years.

Sincerely,

KEN CALVERT,
*Chairman, Subcommittee
on Energy and Environment.*
VERN EHLERS,
Vice Chairman, Committee on Science.
TIM ROEMER,
*Ranking Democrat, Subcommittee
on Energy and Environment.*
LYNN RIVERS,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I am gratified that the funding we identified for zebra mussel research has been retained in this bill that we have before us today. This problem is not trivial and it is not parochial. It will soon affect all coastal areas from the Atlantic to the Pacific to the gulf coast. We desperately need to make progress in understanding more about invasive species and how to control them.

The Sea Grant Program has performed a critical role in addressing this problem. I would like to further thank the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT], who I have worked with very closely on this bill in a very, very bipartisan way and particularly on this zebra mussel problem. I would like to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS] and the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. RIVERS] and also our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] who has also been very supportive and very knowledgeable on this zebra mussel problem.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank the leadership of the two committees in bringing this bill to the floor. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased that the House has a chance today to pass H.R. 437 to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program. The Sea Grant Program was established by Congress in 1966 and has contributed much to the marine sciences over the past 30 years.

The nationwide Sea Grant network is composed of 26 Sea Grant colleges which act as centers for the participation of over 300 uni-

versities from both coastal and inland States. The Sea Grant focus on research, education, technology transfer, and public service makes this a unique program with a long record of accomplishment. In 1994, the National Academy of Sciences conducted an in depth review of the Sea Grant Program and said "Sea Grant has been virtually the only source of funding in the United States for activities in marine policy, and has been a major contributor for the fields of marine aquaculture, coastal and estuarine research, marine fisheries management, seafood safety, marine biotechnology, marine engineering, and marine technology development."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the leadership of both the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources for working out an agreement on Sea Grant reauthorization. It is clear that the Sea Grant Program has always enjoyed strong congressional support from both sides of the aisle and from all of the committees of jurisdiction. Unfortunately, it has not always enjoyed strong support from the administration. From 1984 through 1990, no funding was requested by the administration, yet the Congress continued to provide the needed resources.

More recently, the administration has requested funding for the basic Sea Grant Program but has continued to propose the termination of one project of great importance to many Members of Congress who live in the Great Lakes States. I refer to the zebra mussel research program that has been carried out by the Sea Grant colleges.

The zebra mussel were first sited in 1988 and have rapidly spread throughout all of the Great Lakes, the Hudson River, the St. Lawrence River, and much of the Mississippi Basin. The zebra mussel infestation has assumed nightmarish proportions and has affected electric power generation, industrial water intake facilities, fishing, recreational uses of waterways and beaches, and agriculture.

A female zebra mussel can lay up to 1 million eggs per year of which more than 5 percent will survive. They live up to 5 years and can colonize at a density of 10,000 mussels per square yard. There are no known predators and we lack any real understanding of what control strategies have any chance of success.

Mr. Chairman, when the committee held hearings on the Sea Grant Program, we were unable to determine to our satisfaction why funding for zebra mussel research and other invasive species was not requested. Indeed, Dr. James Baker, Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration readily agreed with us that this is a serious problem in need of Federal attention. I and other interested members of the committee, some of whom will speak today, wrote a letter emphasizing our desire to see this research funded.

I am gratified that the funding we identified for zebra mussel research has been retained in the bill we have before us today. This problem is not trivial and it is not parochial. It will soon affect all coastal areas from the Atlantic to the Pacific to the gulf coast. We desperately need to make progress in understanding more about invasive species and how to control them. The Sea Grant Program has performed a critical role in addressing this problem. I'd like to think Mr. EHLERS, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. CALVERT, and others for their help on this.

Mr. Chairman, I again want to thank the leadership of the two committees in bringing this bill to the floor. I urge all of my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mobile, AL [Mr. CALLAHAN], who also serves as the chairman of the powerful Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs and does such a wonderful job for us.

(Mr. CALLAHAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. SAXTON, for yielding me the time, and I rise in support of H.R. 437, the National Sea Grant College Program Reauthorization Act.

Mr. Chairman, this program is extremely important to all coastal States, not just the State of Alabama. The National Sea Grant College Program is a Federal-State partnership which works to support 29 sea grant programs in coastal and Great Lakes States and Puerto Rico. It is probusiness, proenvironment, and proeducation.

It is a relatively small program which supports fundamental marine research, education, and outreach activities. It assists Federal, State, and local coastal decisionmakers to make informed decisions on issues which affect marine ecosystems, human health, and coastal economies which depend on a healthy and viable research.

In the State of Alabama, Mr. Chairman, the National Sea Grant College Program supports the continuing efforts of the Mississippi-Alabama Sea Grant Consortium, which brings together people from different occupations and scientific disciplines to address common problems and opportunities that affect the coastal regions of the northern Gulf of Mexico and the Nation and the world.

It promotes research on the endangered sea turtle recovery, blue crabs, and oyster disease pathology. It conducts outreach and educational efforts in coordination with Alabama's Dauphin Island Sea Lab so that teachers and the public at large have access to the latest scientific information.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 437 so that the National Sea Grant College Program can continue to promote marine research excellence, environmental conservation, and educational outreach.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN].

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Hawaii, [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], for allowing me the time to speak today in support of H.R. 437, the National Sea Grant College Program Reauthorization Act.

The Sea Grant College Program, established in 1966, provides wise stewardship over our marine and coastal resources. It is a partnership between our universities and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. The mission of the Sea Grant Program is to promote and sponsor research, education, and outreach aimed at the wise utilization and conservation of our Nation's coastal and marine resources in order to develop and maintain a sustainable economy and a healthy environment.

I represent a district in Houston, TX. It is the Port of Houston; and our Sea Grant College is Texas A&M at Galveston, with programs spread all along the gulf coast of Texas and where a person can learn about both the ocean and coast and environment and innovative marine technologies.

The 29th District, like I said, is in the Port of Houston, about 50 miles away from the Texas A&M campus, but it is vital to all the ports along the Texas coast and also to our Nation. Texas A&M Sea Grant College provides business owners, fishermen, and community groups information about how to achieve the most economically while responsibly conserving the marine environment.

Without the Sea Grant Program, the citizens of Texas and our Nation cannot stay current and competitive with the rest of the world. By reauthorizing the Sea Grant Colleges through the year 2000, we have ensured that we will help train future citizens who will not only look to protect our oceans and coastal areas, but they also will be trained to properly use our marine resources.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 437. This bill makes significant improvements in the Sea Grant Program by streamlining the review process, reducing administrative costs, and clarifying the Federal and university roles in the program. This program is a 30-year success story. It has proven its value and worth to our country. Again, I rise in support of the bill and again thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for putting together this effort.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. CALVERT].

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I also want to wish a happy birthday to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER]. I found it interesting that I am somewhat older than the chairman, until one of my colleagues pointed out that, once you become chairman, you become 20 years younger, which explains why we have such longevity around this place.

First, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] for working together to iron out their differences on this Sea Grant Program so we can move forward on this bill.

In particular, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] is to be commended for working diligently through two Congresses to authorize this program. If our brethren in the other body will cooperate, we will succeed this year.

The National Sea Grant Program has been an integral part of our Nation's efforts to better conserve and manage our publicly owned coastal marine resources, which are essential to our continued economic growth.

In 1994, the Ocean Studies Board of the National Research Council reviewed the Sea Grant Program and found that it has over the years played a significant role in U.S. marine science, education, and outreach. In California, the University of California operates the largest of 29 Sea Grant Colleges. In fiscal year 1996, the California program supported 36 research projects at 12 universities in all parts of the State.

These projects have proved to be important for our coastal areas. For example, UCLA's Sea Grant scientists are developing a revolutionary technique that will allow us to determine the different types and origins of bacteria in our coastal waters. Other projects funded by Sea Grant have provided information on the probable movement of oilspills under hundreds of different sea conditions.

Mr. Chairman, the Sea Grant Program is marked by high quality peer-reviewed scientific research. The committee substitute, as agreed to by both the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources, is fiscally responsible and limits bureaucratic overhead to 5 percent of the program's funding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER], who has been very helpful in working with us in a bipartisan way to complete this bill. I would urge my colleagues to support this bill and move it on.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Michigan [Ms. RIVERS].

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to stand in support for funding for the Sea Grant proposal, as well as funding in the area of invasive species. For those of my colleagues who are not familiar with the Great Lakes, and, amazingly, a significant number of people are not, there is a song that refers to the Great Lakes as the inland seas. And for my colleagues who have not actually viewed the Great Lakes, they are very awesome. These are not small bodies of water.

In fact, 20 percent of the world's fresh water exists in the Great Lakes basin. They contain 95 percent of the fresh water surface in the United States. So when the Great Lakes are threatened, to a larger extent our Nation is threatened. We rely on the Great Lakes for

water, for fish, and for other kinds of foods.

Right now, the Great Lakes are suffering a plague, a plague of incredible magnitude, in that zebra mussels, an invasive species who originated in the Caspian Sea, have become predominant across the Great Lakes basin.

Damage attributable to zebra mussels during the 1990's is estimated to be as high as \$5 billion. That is billion with a "b." They are causing extreme difficulty in every manner possible for municipalities who are trying to maintain their water systems, for individuals who may own property on the shore, for sport fishermen and any other number of individuals who take advantage of the Great Lakes.

It is imperative that we maintain funding for zebra mussel research. It is imperative that we recognize the intensity of this problem and the enormity of the effects of this problem. Zebra mussels, as has been said earlier, reproduce prodigiously and their colonies can cover nearly any solid surface in a very short period of time. Inlets become clogged. Docked boats become fouled. And most aquatic habitats have been covered by dense masses of mussels.

The Great Lakes Sea Grant network has frequently taken the lead in addressing the zebra mussel problem through their research, education, and outreach activities. Within a month of the first confirmed sighting in Lake Erie, Sea Grant scientists were researching ways to control them.

It is imperative that we maintain these research programs, that we make this a top priority in Sea Grant research. For those reasons, I support continuing funding of Sea Grant and continuing funding for zebra mussel research.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN], who is also the chairman of the Subcommittee on Benefits.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] yielding me the time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to join others and associate myself with the remarks of the previous speakers in favor of H.R. 437, a bill reported by the Committee on Resources that would reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program.

Mr. Chairman, it is interesting that we have heard from speakers this morning from Texas and Alabama and Indiana and California and Michigan; now I rise from New York to talk about this program. Sea Grant is an outstanding research and public outreach program that seeks useful answers to many of the nagging problems that affect the Nation's oceanic and Great Lakes coastline.

The program is a model for what all Federal research and outreach programs should be. This one, of course, is characterized by peer-reviewed competitive awarding of research grants,

strong focus on research that will solve the real coastal problems that people are dealing with, a strong commitment to translating and extending the results of research to potential users, a shared funding with State, local, and private resources, and finally an emphasis on results that will benefit the lives of our citizens, communities, and businesses.

Along the Great Lakes shores, as my colleague just pointed out, the New York Sea Grant is playing a key role in helping individuals, water and power authorities, Government agencies, and marine business cope with the spread of zebra mussels and other exotics that impact the Lakes' shoreline and ecosystem.

Sea Grant specialists in nearby Brockport, New York, the district of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAFALCE] operate NOAA's Zebra Mussel Information Clearinghouse, which has helped thousands across the State, Nation and the globe to address virtually every aspect of this exotic pest.

Sea Grant specialists continue to assist the watersheds through their public education programs. And lastly, Sea Grant has been an accessible and an impartial source of policy and engineering information on the issue of Great Lakes water levels as well as erosion.

I am also proud to say that the Sea Grant field office, located at the State University of New York at Buffalo, has played a key role in the University's faculty and administration to develop an excellent Great Lakes program that focuses faculty attention and resources on pressing Great Lakes issues and reaches out educationally to all audiences in the greater Buffalo area on the same issues.

H.R. 437 will allow Sea Grant to continue its excellent efforts, and it also takes steps to improve the program. The Committee on Resources has appropriately succeeded in streamlining aspects of the program and has removed previously authorized aspects of the same program that were not warranted to be continued.

I ask all our Members, not only from this area, to make sure that they understand the program is a good program. It enjoys bipartisan support from all sections of the country. All Federal programs, I believe, should reflect the track record of success, low cost, and effectiveness that this program, the Sea Grant program, has exemplified.

I ask all my Great Lakes colleagues, as well as Members of the House, to support H.R. 437 as reported by the Committee on Resources, and I commend the committee members on both sides for the great work that they have done.

□ 1115

Ms. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Could the chairman kindly tell me how much allotted time remains both with the Science Committee and with my committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Hawaii has 17 minutes remaining and the gentleman from New Jersey has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BONIOR].

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, we all know how valuable the National Sea Grant College Program is and we know how important it is as a catalyst for scientific research, but I want to say a word about how the program helps young people learn through outreach and education.

The Michigan Sea Grant Extension offers shipboard education for K through 12 students through their Great Lakes Education Program. Sea Grant's K through 12 program stresses hands-on exploration of our environment to stimulate interest at an early age in scientific studies. The program based in Mount Clemens, MI, targets fourth graders and is offered to all grade school students throughout the country.

I had the good fortune recently to join 40 fourth graders from Saint Joan of Arc Elementary School in Saint Clair Shores on a trip down the Clinton River and into Lake Saint Clair. This is a program that operates throughout the spring and the early months in the fall. It takes fourth graders and it teaches them about the whole process of the lake. The Great Lakes, especially Lake Saint Clair and the connecting waters in my district, are going through a huge change in the eutrophication process that has resulted because of the zebra mussels cleansing the water and letting the sunlight come in, letting the weeds grow and then trapping some of the fecal matter that have created really a disastrous situation in our Great Lakes.

This program educates our young people on how that happens and how to avoid it from happening. The young people on this vessel move from one point on the vessel to another point, and they do experiments for about 2 hours. It is a wonderful program. It educates them about the environment, it teaches them about their lake and how important it is to not only their environment but to the economy of the area. It is something that Sea Grant has done and done very well. I just

want to commend all the folks who worked on this program.

On the day of our trip, the Sea Grant Extension celebrated the participation of its 10,000th student. That is 10,000 students who now know more about the ecology of our lake and about how to use our water resources wisely.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. METCALF].

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Chairman, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 437, I rise in strong support of this excellent reauthorization bill for the National Sea Grant College Program. I want to commend the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Committee on Resources, for introducing this bill to reauthorize a valuable program.

The Sea Grant Program was designed to identify marine resource issues at the grassroots level and bring the scientific expertise of university researchers to bear in addressing them. Sea Grant has a broad network of over 300 colleges, universities, and research institutions which conduct competitive, peer-reviewed scientific research on problems affecting coastal areas.

The sound scientific research that Sea Grant provides is critically important in helping many coastal communities like those I represent in Washington State to improve their economies and our competitiveness in world markets. As former chairman of the Washington State Senate's Environment and Natural Resources Committee and as a member of Washington Sea Grant's Ocean Resources Assessment Advisory Committee, I have had the opportunity over the years to observe Sea Grant's effectiveness. For example, Washington's Sea Grant Program has achieved broad ranging successes, from human lives saved as a direct result of Sea Grant fishing vessel safety training, to reduced bycatch and waste at sea through the development of new fishing techniques. Sea Grant represents an effective partnership between the Federal Government and the States, in which each Federal dollar must be matched at least 50 percent by funds from the States, the private sector or other non-Federal sources.

H.R. 437 is consistent with and authorizes appropriations at exactly the same level as the fiscal year 1997 House-passed Commerce appropriations bill. It also makes significant improvements in the Sea Grant Program by streamlining the proposal review process, reducing administrative costs and capping total program costs below the service level. The National Sea Grant College Program plays a vitally important role in maintaining the health and usefulness of our coastal and marine resources.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote with me in support of this important bill.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. WEYGAND].

(Mr. WEYGAND asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] for yielding me this time. I appreciate the opportunity to be here to voice my strong support for H.R. 437.

Mr. Chairman, Rhode Island, my State, is known as the Ocean State. It has a long and valiant history and a reliance upon Narragansett Bay and the Atlantic Ocean for its economic well-being. The bay creates jobs, it attracts tourists and supplies the foundation of commercial and recreational fishing that is a real mainstay in our economy, not only for Rhode Island but for New England. Narragansett Bay generates an immediate economic impact of over \$2 billion for my small State just on fisheries and things immediately associated with the bay and well over \$10 billion when we think about all the tourism and other aspects that it provides.

The Rhode Island Sea Grant Program and the University of Rhode Island, one of the most distinguished oceanographic institutions in the country, are indispensable contributors to the knowledge base that enables us to be good stewards of our valuable resources. The Rhode Island Sea Grant Program is also, though, more than just that. It is a collaboration of many agencies, like the university, our Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Center, the Environmental Protection Agency and a host of environmental and community groups like Save the Bay, one of the largest environmental groups in the country. At the university, much of our money that comes in for marine research is from Sea Grant.

Currently, the Sea Grant Program is involved in improving long-term forecasting of changes in fishing stocks, allowing us not only to develop long-term sustainability of fisheries in Rhode Island and New England but throughout the world; conducting biotechnical research that may result in potential sources of anticancer compounds, certainly one that has great impact not only to the country but to the world. Also, the Sea Grant Program offers advisory services on harbor management, seafood quality and safety, safety at sea, and educational and career activities for our youngsters as well as our college students.

One of the great new areas of Sea Grant is the area of aquaculture, an area that in Rhode Island and New England's economy which has been very stagnant, is very important, because it will provide new sources of revenue through sea farming and the aquaculture community. We think this is extremely important.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I ask all of my colleagues to strongly support this bill. I think that the Sea Grant Program not only is helpful to the Ocean

State, Rhode Island, but to the Great Lakes, to all parts of our country, our economy, our tourism but, most important, the resources of our great country.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kennedyville on Maryland's beautiful Eastern Shore [Mr. GILCHREST].

Mr. GILCHREST. I thank the gentleman from the Garden State for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] for this compromise bill that goes a long way into understanding the nature and the usefulness and the resourcefulness of the Sea Grant Program.

Mr. Chairman, this program, Sea Grant, takes young idealists and inculcates into them knowledge, experience to become pragmatic, idealistic scientists, to become a piece of the infinite puzzle to understand the mechanics of creation.

What are the problems in the Great Lakes with zebra mussels and how do we solve that? What is the problem in the Chesapeake Bay with MSX and dermo? Where did it come from and why is it so tenacious? What is the problem of fishkills in North Carolina? Millions of fish have died in the estuaries of North Carolina. The tragedy of the commons in the Gulf of Mexico; the coastal fisheries of the United States, where there are more people, better technology, catching fewer fish. How do we solve this?

To understand the complexities of the power and the weaknesses, the endurance and the sensitive limitations of the Earth's natural processes, we need educated, knowledgeable, dedicated young people to begin a lifetime of service to this environmental end.

Mr. Chairman, our resources on planet Earth are limited. There are no more new frontiers on the other side of the horizon on the ground. Our horizons physically are limited and to a certain extent they have come to an end. What is our next frontier? Our next frontier is an intellectual frontier. If we use up our resources in the manner in which we are using them now, especially the resources from the marine ecosystem, we cannot go anywhere in this infinite, hostile environment we call the universe. We are here.

Mr. Chairman, we need science, we need knowledge, and we need the technique to implement that science and that knowledge to preserve the natural processes, which is to preserve the natural resources on this planet.

One of the solutions to this puzzle, Mr. Chairman, is the Sea Grant Program. I encourage my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE].

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I will not use the entire 3 minutes, but I did want to say in my prior life, before I was in Congress and before I was a politician really, I was a Sea Grant coastal law specialist. I mention that, because I learned a lot about the Sea Grant Program and particularly how it benefits the average person. Sea Grant really is a very valuable program because it reaches out to help so many people in very positive ways. I think that many Members of Congress and certainly the public at large are not aware of how far-reaching its positive efforts are. When I was a coastal law specialist, basically I worked with various user groups, if you will, whether it was marina owners or commercial or recreational fishermen or longshoremen, anyone really who was involved in the coastal environment took advantage of what we called the New Jersey Marine Advisory Service, which was basically an outreach program financed through Sea Grant to help those people, working people mostly, who made their living from the sea or from the coastal area.

□ 1130

It was a very unique program in a way because it is one of the few times, I think, when people who are in the Federal employ actually are in the working area, if my colleagues will, and actually helping people on a daily basis with their problems. I thought that it was tremendously valuable, and of course I have also had contact with the Sea Grant program because here in Congress and Federal agencies we have Sea Grant fellows, and I know that this reauthorization legislation specifically provides for the continuation of the Sea Grant fellowship program, again another way to get young people involved, to help interaction here in Washington, as well as with the Federal agencies, to learn more about how we at the Federal Government can be a positive force in the field, so to speak.

In my own State of New Jersey the Sea Grant program is managed by the New Jersey Marine Science Consortium which is an alliance of about 30 colleges, universities, private organizations and individuals interested in marine affairs, and New Jersey Sea Grant is very cost effective. I have to stress that; very cost effective in that all resources are shared by the institutions that participate in the Sea Grant program, thereby avoiding duplicative purchases statewide, and collective State and Federal funds are used for administration of a summer marine science program for college students as well as operation and maintenance of a small research fleet and state-of-the-art sampling equipment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take much more time, but I wanted to, say, just give some recent examples of Sea Grant-supported research and outreach activities in New Jersey that have positively impacted the lives of the residents of my State.

Right now Sea Grant is funding two biotechnology research projects that

help develop products with practical uses in the pharmaceutical and pulp industries. It is sponsoring a commercial fisherman's safety training program. It is supporting a red tide research effort, and the list goes on.

Sea Grant is a valuable program, and we should support this legislation.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Washington, [Mrs. LINDA SMITH].

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Resources from the beautiful State of Washington, I rise in strong support of this bill. The National Sea Grant College Program is very important to the Pacific Coast, but especially to my district. I want to commend the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] of the Committee on Resources and especially the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] who is also the bill's sponsor. But never to forget the subcommittee staff because they actually do so much of the work in making sure that the bill works right.

The National Sea Grant program is a network of over 300 colleges, universities and research institutions throughout the country focused on the wise use of marine resources. Literally thousands of coastal communities and small coastal businesses depend on Sea Grant for a wide range of services and for critical, impartial, scientific advice and help. Over half of our Nation's population resides in coastal districts and Sea Grant plays a significant role in improving the lives of our constituents through high-quality competitive research, education and community outreach.

For example, in my home State of Washington, Sea Grant has helped save our State's shellfish industry which is dominated by small family-owned operations. They have done this through the development of a high-quality, year-round triploid oyster. Sea Grant's information on strategic planning and financial management of public ports has been unmatched, in our area at least, and the program's effort in small coastal communities in our area are demonstrating economic and social benefits of waterfront revitalization.

H.R. 437, as reported by the Committee on Resources, makes significant improvements in the program by streamlining the proposed review processes and reducing administration. Now this is capping the overall program costs while still serving the communities, and this is what this Congress is all about, doing it better, balancing the budget and still serving.

I urge all of my colleagues to support this bill, and I again want to thank the chairman for introducing it and for its sponsor.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. STUPAK].

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 437.

I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for yielding, and would like to congratulate Mr. SAXTON and Mr. ABERCROMBIE for their leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, the National Sea Grant College Program plays a vital role in protecting the fragile ecosystem of the Great Lakes. When the National Sea Grant College Program was originally authorized, it directed that funds be used to research aquatic nuisance species in the Great Lakes region. Typically, most of this money has gone toward zebra mussel research and has been successful in stemming the flow of zebra mussel infestation.

As many of you know, the zebra mussel is a nonindigenous species that infiltrated the Great Lakes in the 1980's when it was dispersed with bilge water from a Black Sea cargo ship. Since then, zebra mussels and other aquatic nuisance species have caused substantial damage to water infrastructure systems. A recent Sea Grant survey of Great Lake facilities using surface water showed the cost of battling zebra mussels from 1989-94 was over \$120 million, in recent years it is up to \$30 million per year.

In addition, a recent study by the Office of Technology Assessment estimates that the power industry alone may spend more than \$3 billion over the next 10 years just to control zebra mussel infestation in water intake systems.

Apart from these economic costs, there is evidence that the zebra mussel may disrupt the lower food chain and deplete valuable Great Lake fish stocks. This could severely impact a \$4 billion sport and food fishery in the Great Lakes region.

Zebra mussel infestation is not a problem that is only limited to the Great Lakes. The zebra mussel is spreading rapidly across the United States, having been found throughout the Mississippi Valley, the Gulf Coast, the Chesapeake Bay, and in locations as far away as California. In fact, the zebra mussel has now spread to 20 States and continues to spread. To give you an idea how fast zebra mussels multiply, it is possible that one zebra mussel could produce as many as 1 million eggs.

The National Sea Grant College Program's research into aquatic nuisance species is crucial and must be maintained and even enhanced if the spread of these species is to be prevented and controlled. The zebra mussel research is especially important, as lessons learned from this research can be applied to the prevention and control of other aquatic nuisance species.

H.R. 437 continues the Federal Government's commitment to zebra mussel research and to fighting the spread of this aquatic nuisance species, which is more than just a nuisance.

In addition Mr. Chairman, Michigan Sea Grant plays a pivotal role in my district in addressing a wide range of issues that are vital to the Great Lakes. For example, Sea Grant is a leader in developing new approaches for the responsible management of Great Lakes fisheries, working with over 600 seafood processors and fishermen to improve seafood safety, coordinating citizen volunteers in my

district to monitor Great Lakes water quality, and helping State and local governments create new economic opportunities in coastal recreation and tourism, while managing development wisely in an industry whose economic impact on my State now rivals that of automobile production.

My Chairman, I strongly urges the passage of this bill.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I want to wish the Chair of the Committee on Science, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER], a happy birthday, and I also want to thank the Chair of the Subcommittee on Fisheries, Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans for his very kind comments on the passing of my father.

Mr. Chairman, we see that there is strong bipartisan support for this effort, and I want to tell Members why. I think that America believes and understands that it may be the land masses of the world that separate the peoples, but it is the oceans that bring us together.

I co-authored the reauthorization of the Sea Grant program basically because I believe it is a great program, one that enables important efforts in marine resource conservation to be properly managed. When we think about our oceans and our coasts and the Great Lakes, they are tremendous resources and of great importance not only to our economy but also to our social and to our cultural vitality. But our population, over half of which lives on 10 percent of the land defined as coastal, puts incredible pressures on these environments. We harvest the fish and other living organisms. We alter the physical environment. We fill in wetlands. We dredge our harbors. We bulkheaded our shorelines. We pollute. We introduce alien species into our ecosystems. We are adding substances to the atmosphere that increases the ultraviolet radiation and alter the globe's climate.

We should see it as a priority to have high-quality, competitive, peer-reviewed science to better understand these dynamic resources, our effects on them, and to propose ways to minimize negative impacts while enhancing economic benefits. Hand in hand with this must come programs to get this information out to the public and user groups with the goal of wise, sustainable use.

For nearly 30 years this is exactly what the Sea Grant program has been doing, and it is doing it in a fiscally responsible way. Federal funding for Sea Grant must be matched by non-Federal contributions. Over half of the funding of Sea Grant programs come from non-Federal sources. Funded at about \$50 million annually, we need to support its reauthorization.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS].

(Mr. EHLERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I join the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST] in commending and complimenting the chairman and ranking members of these two committees for an excellent bill, and I rise to speak in favor of this bill and encourage my colleagues to support it and vote for it.

Over a hundred years ago this Nation established land grant universities which have served this Nation well. One of their primary purposes was to conduct research in the uses of our land, particularly for agriculture, and today we still have a network of agricultural research which is second to none in the world and which has been of great benefit to the farmers and the citizens of this country.

More than half, in fact considerably more than half, of our planet's surface is occupied by oceans and large lakes, and yet we have devoted far less of our resources to research upon the water ways of this planet than we have to the land of our Nation. The good feature of this bill is that it begins and continues the process of research that we have instituted for the oceans and the Great Lakes. The Great Lakes of this Nation are a valuable resource. They hold more than 90 percent of the fresh water in this Nation and are the primary source of fresh water throughout the world.

Michigan alone has greater shoreline than any other State of the Union other than Alaska. We have over 3,000 miles of shoreline which indicates the importance of aquaculture, fisheries, and things of this sort to the State of Michigan. But research and the science necessary to really maintain the fisheries of this planet and the resources of the Great Lakes has been lacking.

This bill will help continue the research we have begun in places such as Ann Arbor and other resource facilities in the Great Lakes area, but throughout this Nation this bill will provide the funding that is needed to do the research necessary to continue to ensure that our fisheries are adequate to supply the needs of our Nation and of other nations.

A new problem has arisen in the recent past and is also addressed in this bill, and that is the problem of invasive nonindigenous species. A major problem at the moment, of course, is the zebra mussel which is creating havoc in the Great Lakes and is rapidly spreading across this Nation. It is plugging water supply lines to power plants, municipalities, creating problems for boaters, ship owners, and we need a great deal more research in understanding the zebra mussel and other invasive species.

I am very pleased that this bill specifically addresses the zebra mussel problem, and I hope in the future we will be able to increase the funding for the study of invasive species so that we can in fact tackle the problem, reduce

the difficulty of dealing with these species in the Great Lakes and in other bodies of water in and upon the shores of this Nation.

It is a good bill, and I urge the support of my colleagues. Vote for it.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I believe that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] has the duty to close the debate. I have four more speakers. I am not sure whether he has more speakers and how much time is left for him, and I wonder if I might impose upon him to allow our speakers to catch up so that we can conclude properly.

Mr. SAXTON. I have no objection to that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Hawaii has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT]. Other speakers have had more time but, as we know, the gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. TRAFICANT] will be able to conclude his remarks within 1 minute.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER] and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON] for this job, and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Now no parts of the Great Lakes touches my district, and I have no ocean frontage, but I am working on that, and the Congress should know that, and I support this bill, but I will be offering an amendment, and that amendment is very simple and straightforward. If we buy American-made products and an American company continues to have business, an American worker gets a paycheck. From that paycheck we get some taxes, and from those taxes we can provide these grants, and it works for all of us.

So we are going to reach out and touch somebody like the phone service, and I will be offering that amendment, and I would appreciate my colleagues' support. But again I would like to commend both of the committees for the compromises and the efforts they made to bring a good bill that will be helpful to science and research in America.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I join with my other colleagues, especially as a representative of Wisconsin, wishing a happy birthday to my colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. SENSENBRENNER].

I rise in strong support today of the National Sea Grants College Program Reauthorization Act as another representative of a Great Lakes district with a wide array of boating and marine interests. I know well the importance of this bill before us. In this bill we are investing, I think, up to \$2.8 million next year to research the control of the zebra mussels in the Great

Lakes. For those colleagues who are not familiar, and I am sure many of them are with this devastating problem of nonindigenous species, I can tell them the invasion of zebra mussels has caused a great burden to the Great Lakes States in the past decade. The zebra mussel: A mollusk that was carried to the Great Lakes in the late 1980's traveling in the ballast water of European freighters. Here in an environment without a natural predator the mussels spread widely, quickly attaching themselves to any hard surface in sight. They have clogged water intakes of sewer systems, utilities and factories, filling boat holes, covering beaches with their sharp shells. They cause great economic and ecological hardship to our region; I used to live on the Great Lakes and know about them.

Currently there is no answer for this disease. If my colleagues can imagine, every female mussel can produce 30 to 40,000 offspring several times a year, every mussel lives up to 8 years. I know it sounds like a bad horror movie, but the problem is real, and unless we contain the research on this species and how to control it, we expect the zebra mussels to continue to spread to other waters and bring their destruction to other regions.

In this bill we will spend up to \$2.8 million to continue the research on the zebra mussel, exploring methods of control, examining how to prevent invasions in the future. If my colleagues think this is a large investment, I ask them to think of businesses all over the Great Lakes which are forced to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars every year to filter and scrape out zebra mussels from their pipes and intake systems.

□ 1245

I hope we will continue our strong support for this vital research.

Part of the reason we have learned much about the zebra mussel is due to this bill and the great Sea Grant College Program. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 437.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I have some additional time which I am not going to use; and with the permission of the Chair, I yield 4 minutes of my time to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE] for the purposes of control, so that he can dispense it to Members on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. For the information of the majority, the gentleman from New Jersey has 7½ minutes remaining, and 4 of those minutes, without objection, are yielded to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE].

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, as always, I am very grateful to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON]. This is in the spirit within which this bill was concluded, and I very much appreciate it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. TAUSCHER].

Mrs. TAUSCHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise to discuss a nonnative aquatic weed which is taking over our Nation's waterways and is rapidly becoming a national problem. While I recognize the extreme threat that other nonnative aquatic species can cause, and the zebra mussel infestation of our Great Lakes and rivers throughout the Midwest is a prime example, I believe we need to begin to focus national attention on directing research funds on controlling and eliminating other nonindigenous aquatic species.

In my State of California we have more nonindigenous species destroying our natural environment than any other State. One of the worst offenders in the San Francisco Bay Delta includes *Egeria Densa*, a water weed that originates in Brazil and has taken over not only our local waterways but the canals, rivers, lakes, and bays around the country, including the Mississippi River, the Florida Everglades, and the Chesapeake Bay. This weed impacts water quality in the bay by displacing native vegetation and choking the waterways, causing severe damage to boats, loss of recreational area, and a dramatic reduction of the property values along the deltas in my district.

Rooted in the bottom of the delta, this nonnative weed reproduces when fragments of the plant break off and travel with boats or tidal flow to be deposited and then grow in another area. The plant picks up nutrients in the delta and, with the help of the Sun, spreads like wildfire throughout the delta sloughs. In the past several years, this spread has accelerated to the point that I fear any solution may soon be too little too late.

Already there are areas that only a couple of years ago were open for boaters, yet are now completely inundated by this weed. In fact, many areas of the delta are now so full of *Egeria Densa* that it has turned canals into clogged beds of weeds in which nothing else can compete.

I support this bill because it provides money for research into aquatic nuisance species like *Egeria Densa*.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to working with the chairman and ranking members of the Committee on Science and the Committee on Resources on this very important issue in the future. Research is needed to develop an effective and environmentally benign method to eradicate *Egeria Densa* before it becomes a major epidemic in my delta and around the Nation.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW] to conclude and close out our side of the debate.

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, to leaders who have worked so hard on this issue, congratulations to both sides and I appreciate the cooperation of the majority in yielding time for us today.

This is such an important bill to the great State of Michigan, as has already been indicated by my colleague from Grand Rapids, MI, we have more Great Lakes, more wonderful waterways than any other State in the Union. It is incredibly important that the sea grant research project be continued and be strengthened in order to monitor the Great Lakes.

The sea grant has contributed substantially to improving the use of Great Lakes resources and understanding them. For instance, in our State, there has been a great focus, as has been talked about already, on the issue of zebra mussels. There is a very important program that is called the inland lake monitoring program that has helped constituents in my district. We have monitored over 100 lakes and found 45 lakes in which there have been zebra mussels identified.

The inland lakes program that is operated through this grant research project allows citizens to learn important information about how to prevent the spread of zebra mussels, how to identify zebra mussels early in their life. It greatly relates to the ability to swim, to boat, to enjoy the wonderful lakes that we have in Michigan as well as around the country, and it is important that we continue our research so that we can prevent zebra mussels in the long run.

I want to share one other important success story about the Michigan Sea Grant Program that I have not heard discussed today, and that is the development of revival techniques for victims of cold water immersion, which is also a success story of the sea grant research project. With the help of the sea grant research project, people who have been underwater for periods of up to one-half hour are now being successfully revived whereas in the past these people had been given up as a drowning death. With the support of a successful sea grant research project and outreach program, the entire approach to cold water immersion has changed.

We know that there is success story after success story in this research program. It is important for our quality of life; it is important for our ecosystem; it is important for the country that we maintain a vigilant research and outreach project through the national sea grant program. I am very pleased to rise with my colleagues in support of H.R. 437 and urge a strong bipartisan vote today.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to take a couple of minutes to close the general debate by saying that this is obviously a program that is very important all across the country. Nowhere is it more important than my home State of New Jersey, where a full 10 percent of all of the marine science consortium members are from New Jersey, headed up, of course,

by the sea grant university, Rutgers University. Through these 31 members of the New Jersey marine science consortium, a number of very worthwhile projects have been carried out.

One of the projects is really a project which is at the forefront of development of technology in marine research. That program is known as the LEO 15 project. LEO is an acronym which stands for Long-term Ecosystem Observatory, which is literally an observatory which is stationed several miles off the New Jersey coast in the Atlantic Ocean. And through fiberoptic connection to shore and satellite technology, the data in a real-time situation is collected and transported via fiberoptic and satellite technology to Rutgers University and directly there into schoolrooms and university rooms all across the country. So that on a real-time basis, people can have knowledge of, study, and make use of the data that is collected from the LEO observatory. It is a very worthwhile tool in helping us to understand on an ongoing basis what is happening in the ocean, on the ocean floor, relative to a variety of scientific issues that are important.

In addition to that, we in New Jersey are studying fish recruitment in estuaries, which means essentially how do we enhance fisheries in the breeding grounds and the spawning grounds in our estuaries. We have a variety of projects with regard to water quality and the impacts of sediments in some of our estuarine areas such as Barnegat Bay. We are using a \$600,000 sea grant each year to study and try and find the answers to oyster diseases and research in that area. We have a workshop ongoing with regard to environmental sustainability of the marine industry, the marina industry, which essentially is a program to enhance the understanding of environmental issues as they are affected by boaters in marinas and those issues.

We also have an ongoing program in New Jersey on the industrial use of marina biotechnology products. In other words, how can we develop and use products which are friendly to the environment. So these programs which are of vital importance to the future use of the marine estuarine environment are of vital importance, and in each case they are carried out because the sea grant program provides the resources to do so.

So I would like to ask that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, it would be nice to get a unanimous vote on this. I have heard no objections.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, let me say that this is another example of a Committee on Resources bill emanating from the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, which enjoys the bipartisan nature of our good relationships with each other between Republicans and Democrats and Members of the House.

So I ask for everyone to support this very, very worthwhile bill.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 437 reauthorizes and amends the National Sea Grant College Program Act of 1966. This bill was introduced by JIM SAXTON, and a number of Members, like me, who believe that this has been an effective Federal program.

Sea Grant was established in 1966 in order to improve our Nation's marine resource conservation efforts, to manage those resources more effectively, and to enhance their proper use. The program is patterned after the highly successful Land Grant College Program, which is familiar to many of our noncoastal Members.

For over 30 years, Sea Grant has successfully achieved its goals through a unique combination of research grants, marine advisory services, and education. Alaska's Sea Grant Program has improved our understanding of commercial fish stocks, the factors affecting the size and health of those stock, and the best economic uses for fishery resources. Using this information, we have developed effective management regimes, and we continue to create more jobs with fewer long-term impacts to our fisheries.

Alaska Sea Grant also supports a comprehensive Marine Advisory Service, which has provided industry training programs on topics ranging from marine safety and seafood technology, to business management for fishermen and shoreside support facilities. Through proper training, we ensure that our industries, businesses, and individuals who depend on productive fisheries can continue to do their jobs effectively. Ron Dearborn, who does an excellent job as Director of the Alaska Sea Grant College Program, is serving as president of the Sea Grant Association this year.

Sea Grant is a perfect example of the type of program that we should support. The program produces tangible results and, most importantly, it maximizes immediate and long-range returns by matching Federal investments with State and private funds.

Unfortunately, during the last Congress, the Resources and Science Committees were unable to reach an agreement on reauthorization legislation. I am pleased that this year those disagreements have been resolved, and we are able to bring this compromise text to the floor. This bill is the product of 3 years of hard work and dedication.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we reauthorize Sea Grant this year, and I compliment Mr. SAXTON for his efforts. This program is important to the State of Alaska, our coastal communities, and every American. Therefore, I strongly urge an "aye" vote on H.R. 437.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 437.

In 1966, Congress established the National Sea Grant College Program in order to encourage the wise stewardship of our marine resources through research, education, outreach, and technology transfer.

Today, there are 29 sea grant programs, one in every coastal State and in Puerto Rico, working in partnership with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

Each program has a common goal: To foster the wise use, conservation, and management of marine and coastal resources through practical research, graduate student education, and public service.

The University of Delaware, designated the Nation's ninth sea grant college in 1976, con-

ducts research in marine biotechnology, coastal engineering, environmental studies, fisheries, marine policy, and seafood science—all vitally important to promoting coastal economic growth and improving the quality of coastal environments.

It plays a key role in training graduate students in marine studies and its outreach staff provides a variety of groups, from business owners to school teachers, with a wealth of timely, objective information and assistance in addressing coastal problems and opportunities.

Delaware's Sea Grant Program and others like it across the country are focused on making the United States the world leader in marine research and the sustainable development of marine resources.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support the National Sea Grant College reauthorization and help make that goal a reality.

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak in strong support of the National Sea Grant College Program and H.R. 437.

The National Sea Grant College Program is an integrated program of research, education, and extension activities which has consistently proven its value to the taxpayer throughout its nearly 30-year history.

Sea Grant works at the precommercial stage, with a focus on small, family owned businesses, to improve the responsible use and development of our Nation's coastal, marine, and Great Lakes resources.

Sea Grant is unique among university-based programs in that it develops useful information through research geared toward improving economic opportunities and conserving natural resources for future generations.

Federal funding for Sea Grant is highly leveraged by contributions from outside the Federal Government. Almost half the funding for Sea Grant comes from non-Federal sources; investments made by Sea Grant are heavily matched by each of the participating States, as well as by universities and the private sector.

Sea Grant supports high-quality, competitive, peer-reviewed scientific research to address critical marine resource issues and opportunities and, importantly, to deliver the results of that research to constituents through Sea Grant marine extension and education programs.

In my home State of New York, Sea Grant has assisted agencies, municipalities and constituents in understanding both the technical and policy implications of prospective erosion control measures for our coastal communities. On Fire Island in my district, and the Fire Island National Seashore, this research has saved taxpayers needless expenditures on approaches that would not work. Sea Grant has also helped charter fishing operators understand the fishery resources they depend on, and has assisted seafood retailers in maintaining the quality and safety of products they sell to consumers.

I would like to commend my colleagues on the Resources and Science Committees for bringing H.R. 437 to the floor today. This bill makes significant improvements in the Sea Grant Program by streamlining the proposal review process, reducing administrative costs, and clarifying the Federal and university roles in the program. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 437 to make Sea Grant an even better program than the fine one it is today.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 437, and I want to commend my colleague, Chairman DON YOUNG of the Resources Committee, for his initiative in bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor.

The National Sea Grant College Program is a network of over 300 colleges, universities, technical schools, and research institutions located throughout the country which provide economic opportunities and address real problems associated with our abundant coastal and marine resources. Sea Grant represents a strong university-business-Government partnership that responds to local, regional, and national needs.

Federal funding for the Sea Grant Program is highly leveraged by contributions from outside the Federal Government. Almost half of the funding for Sea Grant comes from matching grants funds from research institutions. In South Carolina, Sea Grant funds are often used as seed money to leverage funding from other Federal, State, local, and private sources.

For example, the Sea Grant Program in South Carolina is part of a nationwide network of university campuses and marine laboratories involved with Operation Pathfinder, an educational initiative involving the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the U.S. Navy, and the U.S. Department of the Interior to train elementary and middle-school teachers in multidisciplinary skills in oceanography and coastal processes.

Of grave importance, Mr. Chairman, is the fact that South Carolina and other Southeastern and Gulf States are subject to a number of hurricanes and coastal storms annually. Risks to life and property associated with these coastal natural hazards will increase with the anticipated growth of coastal populations in this region over the next several decades, from 36 million people currently to over 73 million by the year 2010. According to the Insurance Institute for Property Loss Reduction, these storms cost an estimated \$58 billion in insured losses attributable to wind alone, with total insured losses produced by Hurricane Hugo, Andrew, Iniki, and the winter storms of 1993 and 1994 of \$42.7 billion. The Sea Grant Program in South Carolina has initiated a coordinated research and extension program on coastal natural hazards which seeks to mitigate and reduce the amount of damage and subsequent monetary loss to property owners and the insurance industry. Examples of such efforts include research and development of low-cost, structural retrofit strategies for homeowners, development of a vulnerability mode for use by emergency management personnel to predict storm damage and cleanup needs, the formation of a South Carolina Association for Hazard Mitigation, and the development of a Community Sustainability Center as an educational and training facility for schools, planning and building code officials, and hazards engineers.

H.R. 437 makes significant improvements in the Sea Grant Program. It streamlines the proposal review process, reduces administrative costs, caps the total program costs below the current services level, and clarifies Federal and academic roles in the program.

I would urge my colleagues to recognize and acknowledge the many contributions to the Nation's economic development and resource management made by the National

Sea Grant College Program over the last 30 years by voting in support of this important bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the National Sea Grant College Program Reauthorization Act of 1997, H.R. 437.

My home State of California is home to the largest Sea Grant Program in the Nation. The California Sea Grant College system is a statewide, multiuniversity program of marine research, extension services, and education. Through the research it sponsors, California Sea Grant contributes to the growing body of knowledge about our coastal and ocean resources and helps solve contemporary problems in marine ecosystems. Its extension services transfer this knowledge to a wide community of users in California, the Pacific region, and the Nation.

Since the beginning of the Sea Grant Program in 1968, California has become a leader in Marine Biology and the development of new products in the areas of marine pharmacology, aquaculture, fisheries, water quality, coastal habitat, and ocean engineering. The universities participating in this program are known for their leadership and accomplishments in the study of our oceans. We in San Diego are particularly proud of the work done at Scripps Institute of Oceanography, a part of the University of California at San Diego. Scripps has achieved global recognition for its pioneering work in oceanography, due in no small part to the Sea Grant Program.

Almost everyone living in southern California is affected by the management of our oceans for jobs, recreation, goods and services. The top seven ocean related industries in California generated nearly \$20 billion in direct and indirect economic activity, supporting nearly 500,000 jobs. However, the preservation and study of our oceans is important not only to those who live in California or along the coasts but to the Nation as a whole.

I encourage all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this program by voting for H.R. 437.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 437, the Marine Resources Revitalization Act of 1997 and I want to commend both the Resources and Science Committees for reaching a compromise on this very important bill. We have needed to reauthorize the National Sea Grant Program since October 1995 and I applaud Representatives SAXTON, YOUNG, ABERCROMBIE, and FARR on their leadership.

As a member from a coastal district, I am acutely aware of the problems of the coastal marine environment, and of the excellent work of the Sea Grant Program to address these problems. I remain a supporter of Sea Grant's peer-reviewed research, education, and outreach programs that deal with problems in Maryland such as oyster disease and chemical contaminants in coastal waters.

Established in 1966 to improve the conservation, management, and utilization of ocean and coastal resources, the Sea Grant College Program has been a national leader in conducting scientifically based marine research and distributing the results to hundreds of universities throughout the country. The University of Maryland, located in my district in College Park, is 1 of 26 designated Sea Grant Colleges and is a national leader on living marine and estuarine resources research.

Mr. Chairman, the Chesapeake Bay is arguably the world's greatest estuary and offers

the scientific community one of the most abundant and important places to conduct research. Over the past several years, the oyster population has become increasingly threatened by diseases such as MSX and Dermo, and Sea Grant has been leading the way on the Oyster Disease Research Program which is providing a better understanding of shellfish disease.

Today, Sea Grant continues to provide scientific data and analysis which are used in efforts to prevent oyster parasites from developing. I will support H.R. 437, which will authorize the program through fiscal year 2000, and continue to support appropriations for Sea Grant. The Chesapeake Bay is one of Maryland's greatest natural assets, and in my continued efforts to protect, preserve, and promote this magnificent resource, I will remain a strong supporter of the University of Maryland's work with the National Sea Grant Program.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation to reauthorize this very important environmental program.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this bill, which would fully reauthorize a program that has been vital to our Nation's oceanic industries.

The Sea Grant Program was established in 1966 to improve our Nation's marine resource conservation and management efforts, and is modeled after the very successful Land Grant College Program.

The fishing industry in the Pacific Northwest produces about 55 percent of the Nation's seafood, and is a critical component of many coastal economies in my State. The Oregon Sea Grant Program has been highly successful in its research and marine extension programs, which are oriented toward this industry.

One example of its research activities involves the utilization of seafood wastes. Few people realize that between 30 and 40 percent of the seafood raw material is actually used in food products, while most of the remaining material typically goes to waste. The Oregon Sea Grant Program helps fund research which examines the potential for using some of this waste material in products such as fishmeal and bioactive products including enzymes. These efforts have spawned new, multimillion dollar industries in the Pacific Northwest. Researchers are also studying ways to remove bioactive components of seafood waste water to save money for both processors, municipalities, and customers.

The Oregon program has also been very successful in assisting fishing dependent families adapt to the changing industry conditions, and has been a major force in the development of the Pacific Whiting Industry in Oregon. In addition, the Sea Grant Program is also involved in State and local efforts to restore severely degraded salmon and watershed habitats.

Other programs around the Nation, working closely with industries, have developed new aquaculture techniques, designed improved coastal planning schemes, created new methods of saving cold-water drowning victims, and created a comprehensive data base on toxic contaminants in an aquatic system. And again, I want to stress that the benefits of Sea Grant extend beyond the applied commercial and environmental effects. This university program has been instrumental in educating future generations of researchers in the techniques and nuances of marine science.

These successes clearly warrant support for fully funding the program at levels consistent with those in recent years, as this bill authorizes.

I am convinced that these and many other basic research programs are wise investments in the Nation's economic future. We now have more than anecdotal evidence that research pays off handsomely for our economy over time, but it also pays off by significantly improving our quality of life. Scientists have been doing more with less in recent years. These advancements of efficiency should be commended and continued. However, we must continue to acknowledge the invaluable responsibilities shouldered by our research communities, especially on university campuses. We must maintain strong support for important scientific investigations and for the education of students across the science, math and engineering disciplines.

I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 437, a bill to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration [NOAA].

In New York, the Sea Grant Program, based at the University of Stony Brook on Long Island, has been a vital force in finding answers to critical coastal issues that affect New York's fishing and tourism industries. Stony Brook's Sea Grant supports more than 20 scientific research projects annually and has provided more than \$25.3 million in support of research, education, and outreach projects since its formation more than 25 years ago.

Over the past 4 years, Stony Brook's Sea Grant Program has focused a great deal on the causes of periodic outbreaks of brown tide algae in Long Island's coastal waters, particularly on the East End and in the Great South and Moriches Bays. In fact, the Federal Coastal Ocean Program [COP], under NOAA, has awarded \$1.5 million in grants to researchers studying the brown tide algae blooms that have plagued the waters of Long Island's East End and South Shore. Administering the Sea Grant Program at Stony Brook, the 3-year Brown Tide Research Initiative [BTRI] is a coordinated effort by nationally recognized experts at eight universities and research institutions, including the University at Stony Brook.

The National Sea Grant Program is a network of 29 university-based programs located in States with coastlines on either oceans or the Great Lakes. In New York, the Sea Grant Program is a joint operation between the State University of New York at Stony Brook and Cornell University. New York Sea Grant conducts important research into the forces of coastal erosion, providing invaluable insight for beach protection programs.

The national investment in the Sea Grant Program is a tremendously wise one, and not solely from an ecological standpoint. Financially, the program works. Every Federal dollar is matched by \$2 in State, local, and university resources. Though outmatched by other sources, it is the Federal investment that acts as the program's catalyst, attracting much-needed support from other, diverse sources.

The Brown Tide Research Program undertaken at Stony Brook, is just one example of how the National Sea Grant College Program works, but it is indicative of the collaborative effort and broad commitment that is the pro-

gram's hallmark. It is the model for public, private, and university partnerships that pool resources, facilities, and brain power to tackle a serious problem that no single entity is capable of addressing.

In the long run, an alliance like the New York Sea Grant Program at Stony Brook will save Long Island taxpayers' money, while conducting important scientific research that ultimately solves the problems that afflict our most important industries: fishing and tourism.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 437 and in support of the Sea Grant Program that serves as a model for all public programs because of its ability to work smarter and more efficiently for its customers, the American people.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and numbered 1 shall be considered by section as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, and pursuant to the rule, each section is considered as having been read.

The Clerk will designate section 1.

The text of section 1 is as follows:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National Sea Grant College Program Reauthorization Act of 1997".

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of the amendment in the nature of a substitute be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM ACT.

Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the National Sea Grant College Program Act (33 U.S.C. 1121 et seq.).

SEC. 3. AMENDMENTS TO DEFINITIONS.

(a) SEA GRANT INSTITUTION.—Section 203 (33 U.S.C. 1122) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(16) The term 'sea grant institution' means—

"(A) any sea grant college or sea grant regional consortium, and

"(B) any institution of higher education, institute, laboratory, or State or local agency conducting a sea grant program with amounts provided under this Act."

(b) FIELD RELATED TO OCEAN, COASTAL, AND GREAT LAKES RESOURCES.—Section 203(4) (33 U.S.C. 1122(4)) is amended to read as follows:

"(4) The term 'field related to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources' means any discipline or field, including marine affairs, resource management, technology, education, or science, which is concerned with or likely to improve the understanding, assessment, development, utilization, or conservation of ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources."

(c) SECRETARY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 203(13) (33 U.S.C. 1122(13)) is amended to read as follows:

"(13) The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Under Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere."

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—The Act is amended—

(A) by striking section 203(15) (33 U.S.C. 1122(15));

(B) in section 209(b) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)), as amended by this Act, by striking "the Under Secretary,"; and

(C) by striking "Under Secretary" every other place it appears and inserting "Secretary".

SEC. 4. CONSULTATIONS REGARDING LONG-RANGE PLANNING GUIDELINES AND PRIORITIES AND EVALUATION.

Section 204(a) (33 U.S.C. 1123(a)) is amended in the last sentence by inserting after "The Secretary" the following: "in consultation with the sea grant institutions and the panel established under section 209,".

SEC. 5. DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.

Section 204(c) (33 U.S.C. 1123(c)) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) DUTIES OF DIRECTOR.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall administer the National Sea Grant College Program subject to the supervision of the Secretary. In addition to any other duty prescribed by law or assigned by the Secretary, the Director shall—

"(A) advise the Secretary with respect to the expertise and capabilities which are available within or through the National Sea Grant College Program, and provide (as directed by the Secretary) those which are or could be of use to other offices and activities within the Administration;

"(B) encourage other Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities to use and take advantage of the expertise and capabilities which are available through the National Sea Grant College Program, on a cooperative or other basis;

"(C) encourage cooperation and coordination with other Federal programs concerned with ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources conservation and usage;

"(D) advise the Secretary on the designation of sea grant institutions and, in appropriate cases, if any, on the termination or suspension of any such designation;

"(E) encourage the formation and growth of sea grant programs; and

"(F) oversee the operation of the National Sea Grant Office established under subsection (a).

"(2) DUTIES WITH RESPECT TO SEA GRANT INSTITUTIONS.—With respect to the sea grant institutions, the Director shall—

"(A) evaluate the programs of the institutions, using the guidelines and priorities established by the Secretary under subsection (a), to ensure that the objective set forth in section 202(b) is achieved;

"(B) subject to the availability of appropriations, allocate funding among the sea grant institutions so as to—

"(i) promote healthy competition among those institutions,

"(ii) promote successful implementation of the programs developed by the institutions under subsection (e), and

"(iii) to the maximum extent consistent with the other provisions of this subparagraph, provide a stable base of funding for the institutions; and

"(C) ensure compliance by the institutions with the guidelines for merit review published pursuant to section 207(b)(2)."

SEC. 6. DUTIES OF SEA GRANT INSTITUTIONS.

Section 204 (33 U.S.C. 1123) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(e) DUTIES OF THE SEA GRANT INSTITUTIONS.—Subject to any regulations or guidelines promulgated by the Secretary, it shall

be the responsibility of each sea grant institution to—

"(1) develop and implement, in consultation with the Secretary and the panel established under section 209, a program that is consistent with the guidelines and priorities developed under section 204(a); and

"(2) conduct merit review of all applications for project grants or contracts to be awarded under section 205."

SEC. 7. REPEAL OF SEA GRANT INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM.

(a) REPEAL.—Section 3 of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 1124a) is repealed.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 209(b)(1) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)(1)) is amended by striking "and section 3 of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976".

SEC. 8. DESIGNATION OF SEA GRANT INSTITUTIONS.

Section 207 (33 U.S.C. 1126) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 207. SEA GRANT COLLEGES AND SEA GRANT REGIONAL CONSORTIA.

"(a) DESIGNATION.—The Secretary may designate an institution of higher learning as a sea grant college, and an association or alliance of two or more persons as a sea grant regional consortium, if the institution, association, or alliance—

"(1) is maintaining a balanced program of research, education, training, and advisory services in fields related to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources;

"(2) will cooperate with other sea grant institutions and other persons to solve problems or meet needs relating to ocean, coastal, and Great Lakes resources;

"(3) will act in accordance with such guidelines as are prescribed under subsection (b)(2);

"(4) meets such other qualifications as the Secretary, in consultation with the sea grant review panel established under section 209, considers necessary or appropriate; and

"(5) is recognized for excellence in marine resources development and science.

"(b) REGULATIONS AND GUIDELINES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe the qualifications required to be met under subsection (a)(4).

"(2) MERIT REVIEW.—Within 6 months after the date of enactment of the National Sea Grant College Program Reauthorization Act of 1997, the Secretary, after consultation with the sea grant institutions, shall establish guidelines for the conduct of merit review by the sea grant institutions of project proposals for grants and contracts to be awarded under section 205. The guidelines shall, at a minimum, provide for peer review of all research projects and require standardized documentation of all peer review.

"(c) SUSPENSION OR TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION.—The Secretary may, for cause and after an opportunity for hearing, suspend or terminate any designation under subsection (a)."

SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND FELLOWSHIPS.—Section 212(a) (33 U.S.C. 1131(a)) is amended to read as follows:

"(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

"(A) \$54,300,000 for fiscal year 1998;

"(B) \$55,400,000 for fiscal year 1999; and

"(C) \$56,500,000 for fiscal year 2000.

"(2) ZEBRA MUSSEL AND OYSTER DISEASE RESEARCH.—Of the amount authorized for a fiscal year under paragraph (1)—

"(A) up to \$2,800,000 of the amount may be made available as provided in section 1301(b)(4)(A) of the Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990 (16 U.S.C. 4741(b)(4)(A)) for competitive

grants for university research on the zebra mussel; and

"(B) up to \$2,000,000 of the amount may be made available for competitive grants for university research on oyster disease."

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 212(b) (33 U.S.C. 1131(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking so much as precedes paragraph (2) and inserting the following:

"(b) ADMINISTRATION.—

"(1) LIMITATION.—Of the amount appropriated for each fiscal year under subsection (a), an amount, not exceeding 5 percent of the lesser of the amount authorized under subsection (a) for the fiscal year or the amount appropriated under subsection (a) for the fiscal year, may be used for the administration of this Act, including section 209, by the National Sea Grant Office and the Administration;"

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "subsections (a) and (c)" and inserting "subsection (a)"; and

(B) by striking "(2)" and inserting "(2) LIMITATION ON USE OF OTHER AMOUNTS.—"; and

(3) by moving paragraph (2) 2 ems to the right, so that the left margin of paragraph (2) is aligned with the left margin of paragraph (1), as amended by paragraph (1) of this subsection.

(c) REPEAL.—Section 212 (33 U.S.C. 1131) is amended by repealing subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d) and (e) in order as subsections (c) and (d).

(d) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING; NOTICE OF REPROGRAMMING OR REORGANIZATION.—Section 212 (33 U.S.C. 1131), as amended by subsection (c) of this section, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

"(e) PROHIBITION OF LOBBYING ACTIVITIES.—None of the funds authorized by this section shall be available for any activity whose purpose is to influence legislation pending before the Congress, except that this subsection shall not prevent officers or employees of the United States or of its departments or agencies from communicating to Members of Congress on the request of any Member or to Congress, through the proper channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

"(f) NOTICE OF REPROGRAMMING.—If any funds authorized by this section are subject to a reprogramming action that requires notice to be provided to the Appropriations Committees of the House of Representatives and the Senate, notice of such action shall concurrently be provided to the Committees on Science and Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate.

"(g) NOTICE OF REORGANIZATION.—The Secretary shall provide notice to the Committees on Science, Resources, and Appropriations of the House of Representatives, and the Committees on Commerce, Science, and Transportation and Appropriations of the Senate, not later than 15 days before any major reorganization of any program, project, or activity of the National Sea Grant College Program."

SEC. 10. CLERICAL, CONFORMING, AND TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 203(3) (33 U.S.C. 1122(3)) is amended by striking "the term" and inserting "The term".

(2) Section 203(6) (33 U.S.C. 1122(6)) is amended by moving subparagraph (F) 2 ems to the right, so that the left margin of subparagraph (F) is aligned with the left margin of subparagraph (E).

(3) The heading for section 204 (33 U.S.C. 1124) is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 204. NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM."

(4) Section 209 (33 U.S.C. 1128) is amended by striking all of the matter that follows the first full sentence through "shall advise", and inserting "(b) DUTIES.—The panel shall advise".

(5) Section 205(b)(3) (33 U.S.C. 1124(b)(3)) is amended by striking "or section 206".

(6) Section 204(d)(1) (33 U.S.C. 1123(d)(1)) is amended—

(A) by striking "five positions" and inserting "one position"; and

(B) by striking "the maximum rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332" and inserting "a rate established by the Secretary, not to exceed the maximum daily rate payable under section 5376".

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 204(b)(2) (33 U.S.C. 1123(b)(2)) is amended by striking "maximum rate for GS-18" and all that follows through the end of the sentence and inserting "maximum rate payable under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code".

(2) Section 209 (33 U.S.C. 1128) is amended—

(A) in subsection (b)(3) by striking "colleges and sea grant regional consortia" and inserting "institutions"; and

(B) in subsection (c)(1) in the last sentence in clause (A) by striking "college, sea grant regional consortium," and inserting "institution".

(c) TECHNICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 209(c)(5)(A) (33 U.S.C. 1128(c)(5)(A)) is amended by striking "the daily rate for GS-18 of the General Schedule under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code" and inserting "a rate established by the Secretary, not to exceed the maximum daily rate payable under section 5376 of title 5, United States Code".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FARR OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FARR of California:

Page 6, beginning at line 16, amend section 7 to read as follows:

SEC. 7. SEA GRANT INTERNATIONAL PROGRAM.

(a) AMENDMENT.—Section 3(a) of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 1124a(a)) is amended in paragraph (6), by striking "living marine resources" and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and inserting "living marine resources."

(b) PROGRAM SUNSET.—

(1) REPEAL.—Section 3 of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976 (33 U.S.C. 1124a) is repealed.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 209(b)(1) (33 U.S.C. 1128(b)(1)) is amended by striking "and section 3 of the Sea Grant Program Improvement Act of 1976".

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect October 1, 2000.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment which essentially maintains the Sea Grant International Program authorization without limitation on the countries with which we can collaborate through the year 2000.

We are now becoming more and more aware of how our oceans and Great Lakes are truly international. We just heard of the issue of the zebra mussels which obviously is not just a United States issue, it is a Canadian issue. The very nature of the marine environment dictates that ocean resources are seldom, if ever, conveniently contained within one nation's boundaries.

On May 19 and 20 of this year, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] hosted an advisory committee on the protection of the seas here in this Capitol. I attended that with Vice President AL GORE, with the Speaker of the House, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. GINGRICH]; Secretary of Defense, William Cohen; Secretary of the Navy, John Dalton; and fellow Representatives including the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GILCHREST], the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. KENNEDY], the gentleman from California [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from California [Mr. ROHRBACHER]; the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SAXTON], and others, as well as representatives from agencies and countries from around the world. We were all here to discuss the importance of oceans in the world's security.

□ 1200

We must recognize that the need for international collaboration and conservation is indeed international, and our goal is of sustainable efforts. My amendment would extend the authorization through the year 2000, with the hope that in the intervening years we will dedicate money to this program and revisit it in the 3 years to judge whether it has merit.

It also opens up the program to be used to collaborate with any country which we believe would be advantageous to us to work with for marine resources issues. I want to make it clear that this program provides for international collaboration on research, education, and conservation, and that funding is only allowed to go to institutions of higher education, laboratories, and institutes in the United States and U.S. territories.

I will be glad to answer any questions on my amendment. I know of no opposition, and I would ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following document:

ANNEX IV

POTOMAC DECLARATION: TOWARD ENHANCED OCEAN SECURITY INTO THE THIRD MILLENIUM

The Vice-President of the United States of America, Hon. Al Gore; Speaker of the House of Representatives, Newt Gingrich; Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defence of Portugal, Senhor Antonio Vitorino; Executive Director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), Ms. Elizabeth Dowdeswell; Assistant Secretary General of the United Nations, Dr. Nay Htun; 215 governmental and other participants from Australia, Belgium, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark, India, Japan, Korea, Mexico, Mozambique, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Philippines, Portugal, Russian Federation, the Seychelles, South Africa, Sweden, Thailand, Ukraine, United Kingdom and the United States of America, including 18 ministers and deputy ministers; representatives of the following intergovernmental organizations: United Nations; UNEP; United Nations Development Programme (UNDP); the World Bank; the International Oceanographic Commission (IOC) of UNESCO; the Organisation of American States (OAS); and the Commission of the Eu-

ropean Union; as well as members of the European Parliament and legislatures from Brazil, Philippines, and the United States; representatives of ACOPS and other non-governmental organisations (NGOs); and representatives of the scientific community and private sector adopted the following Declaration:

THE CONFERENCE

Recognising that:

Continuing intensification of human activity in coastal and marine areas will adversely affect marine and coastal ecosystems world-wide and threatens the well-being of the human population. The natural resource base of world fisheries is threatened by over exploitation, habitat degradation, introduction of alien species and loss of biological diversity. Human security is threatened by unsustainable food production, increased public health hazards and unemployment, which may contribute to escalating human conflicts. Humans themselves have entered into conflict with the very environment which supports them. It is vital to take immediate action to strengthen environmental security if global human security is to be sustained;

Climate change threatens to affect ocean levels and temperature, the land and peoples living in low elevation coastal regions, and species dependent on oceans and land touched by oceans. The oceans play an essential role in the planet's climate, though the mechanisms are poorly understood; and

Sustainable development, including conservation of the marine environment, can actually increase environmental, food and economic security and therefore provide a foundation for political security.

Recommended that:

1. Policies and action by all economic and social sectors adversely affecting the marine environment and resources should be made compatible with sustainable development in order to promote environmental, food and economic security, and to prevent conflicts over natural resources between and within states. Consciousness of the fact that poverty is a root cause of environmental problems must guide policy making. Wasteful consumption patterns must also be addressed.

2. Management of marine and coastal ecosystems, carried out within the framework of integrated coastal and watershed areas management and responsible fisheries, should be based on the full application of the precautionary principle and ecosystem approach, thus achieving the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and its components in marine and coastal ecosystems.

3. Scientific research should be increasingly directed towards the understanding of the marine and coastal ecosystems thus providing a basis for policies and action for their conservation and sustainable use. Such research would profit from greater and improved access to data which has been declassified or derived from national security systems, and should include use of innovative techniques for measurement of basic parameters. The possibilities of satellite monitoring of the marine environment should be exploited to the full.

4. International cooperation for the protection of the marine environment and the sustainable use of marine resources must be expanded following the framework of active implementation of the United Nations Law of the Sea Convention, and other relevant conventions and agreements in the fields of environment, fisheries and marine transport, among others. All governments that have not done so, should ratify UNCLOS, as amended in 1994, given that it is an histori-

cal international agreement which establishes global maritime boundaries and provides a framework for balancing governance of marine resources, conservation, and traditional freedoms of navigation for trade and naval movements. Binding agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Framework Convention on Climate Change should also be ratified by all governments as soon as possible. Moreover, initiatives such as the Global Plan of Action for the Protection of the Marine Environment from Land-based Sources and the International Coral Reef Initiative, should also be actively supported. Degradation of the marine environment, not yet covered by international agreements, such as the problems posed by hazardous organic substances, should be addressed as soon as possible in an integrated manner. Regional cooperation for the protection of the marine environment and sustainable fisheries should be strengthened and coordinated.

5. It is of paramount importance to deepen our current understanding of the root causes of the environmental issues in terms of market failures, inadequacies in policy and governance, and deficiencies in information. A profound interdisciplinary study, bridging social and physical sciences and integrating seas and associated land catchment areas, is required at a national, regional and global level. This should lead to practical measures to address the root causes of the problems themselves. Initiatives such as the recently proposed GEF Global International Water Assessment (GIWA) should be supported.

6. In order to preserve the availability and health of the world's fisheries, effective conservation measures based on the FAO Code of Conduct of Responsible Fishing and the UN Agreement on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish, should be put into place. Harvesting capacities should be controlled, management institutions established, fish habitat protected and the necessary scientific knowledge and data pursued. Major efforts should be made to strengthen decision making in regional fisheries organizations or arrangements.

7. Data gathering systems should be put in to place so that the information and knowledge is available for wise decision-making, especially in the coastal zones. These observation systems should be used to ensure continuous benefit. Governments should actively support global oceanic observation systems at a national, regional and global level. Scientific research and information should be directed towards wise decision-making in marine and coastal areas.

8. The end of the cold war and diminution of the risk of global conflict has opened up new possibilities for utilizing national security systems formerly devoted to military activities for peaceful purposes and, in particular, for enhancing the capacity for environmental protection and for sustainable development. The military establishment should share with other societal sectors its enormous scientific and technological capabilities in order to improve our understanding of the functioning of the coastal and marine ecosystems, a condition to enhance environmental security of marine and coastal areas. Each nation should initiate a review of their sensitive data and information, as pioneered by Russia and the US, for declassification and use in diagnosing environmental problems and expanding our knowledge base.

9. Environmental considerations should be incorporated into all sectors of government, while empowering environmental ministries to actively promote this development. Civil society should also be empowered through greater access to environmental information and more active participation in decision-

making. This is of particular relevance for local communities which have traditionally inhabited coastal zones and made use of marine resources.

10. Concerted national and international efforts should be undertaken to introduce environmental studies into all levels of formal school curricula at a global level, in order to eliminate environmental illiteracy, increase environmental awareness, and promote deeper environmental ethics. Up-to-date scientific knowledge about the oceans should be popularised and disseminated to the public both through formal education and creative communication channels such as arts, music, and multi-media. In support of this effort, the year 2000 should be declared as the "Year of Environmental Awareness" by the UN General Assembly at its forthcoming Special Session.

11. Efforts should be directed at national, regional, and global levels for mitigation and adaptation to global climate change, as it is likely to threaten the lives and livelihood of millions of people via sea-level rise, changes in ocean salinity, temperature, and production of fisheries and other aquatic life. Climate change affects the economic, environmental and food security of nations. Therefore multilateral and bilateral cooperation should be enhanced to reduce the negative effects of climate change.

12. Given the urgent and imperative need to fully implement the above recommendations, a concrete action plan should be developed to elaborate problems and root causes, and to propose specific actions by ACOPS, and to recommend appropriate organisations and parties to bear responsibility for the implementation of the measures. Such an action plan could be presented to the ACOPS/GLOBE Conference (Stockholm, January 1998) and could be adopted at its ministerial segment. The Conference will inaugurate the 1998 International Year of the Oceans.

13. The Potomac Declaration should be submitted, through the host country, to the Special Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations, to be held in June 1997; to appropriate United Nations Agencies and regional organisations, including regional economic integration communities; appropriate government agencies; legislative bodies, including GLOBE, Asia Pacific Parliamentarians for Environment and Development, and the International Parliamentary Union; appropriate representatives of the private sector; and local authorities and non-governmental organisations.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the Farr amendment will maintain authorization of the Sea Grant International Program which promotes shared marine activities in nations which have mutual interest with the United States.

As we all know, the world is 70 percent covered with water, and the oceans and their resources recognize no political boundaries. It is helpful to our national interests to have a mechanism through which we can collaborate with other coastal nations on research that will ultimately affect all of us, so I believe the Farr amendment is well-intended, well-written, and I rise in support, and ask others on this side of the aisle to support his amendment as well.

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of the Farr amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TAUZIN

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TAUZIN:

Page 8, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 9, line 3, and insert the following:

"(I) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act—

"(A) \$55,300,000 for fiscal year 1998;

"(B) \$56,400,000 for fiscal year 1999; and

"(C) \$57,500,000 for fiscal year 2000.

Page 9, line 4, strike "DISEASE".

Page 9, strike lines 14 through 16 and insert the following:

"(B) up to \$3,000,000 of the amount may be made available for competitive grants for university research on oyster diseases and oyster-related human health risks."

Mr. TAUZIN (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offer today is an amendment to provide authority for up to \$3 million of the amount that may be available for competitive grants for university research on oyster diseases and oyster-related human health risks.

Oysters are an important national resource in America. They are a safe and nutritional meat protein that provides many benefits to those who enjoy eating them. Of course, millions are consumed each year. But research into health-related aspects of oyster growing and harvesting and sales and consumption in America is very important.

Earlier this year the President called for the national food safety initiative. The proposal we make today is consistent with the President's approach of developing positive and practical solutions to improve food safety. The program brings the Sea Grant scientists and the oyster industry together to find solutions to concerns related to oysters' health and particularly to diseases that might be related to humans, who enjoy eating oysters in America.

This amendment provides for an increased authorization of \$1 million in each of the fiscal years 1998, 1999, and the year 2000, and the authority to make available those moneys for competitive grants at Sea Grant universities around the country.

Sea Grant universities are currently in fact doing a great deal of work in this area. This amendment is meant to make sure that not only the oyster diseases are studied but oyster-related health concerns to humans who enjoy oyster products in America are also

studied and, indeed, identified, and taken care of in this country.

I urge the committee to adopt this amendment. It is very much in line with the excellent work the Sea Grant College Program authorization has already accomplished in many areas, and will compliment the work already being done by many Sea Grant universities in this country in this important health and food safety area.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I rise to compliment the gentleman from Louisiana for a very well thought out amendment, Mr. Chairman. Obviously New Jersey's Sea Grant Program involves some research relative to oysters. This is a side of the aisle, different but equally important angle. I offer my strong support and ask others to do the same.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, we have no opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN]. We are all oyster lovers.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further debate on the amendment?

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. TAUZIN].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. TRAFICANT

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TRAFICANT:

At the end of the bill, insert the following new section:

SEC. 11. BUY AMERICAN.

(a) COMPLIANCE WITH BUY AMERICAN ACT.—No funds appropriated pursuant to section 212(a), as amended by this Act, may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a-10c, popularly known as the "Buy American Act").

(b) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be authorized to be purchased with financial assistance provided under section 212(a), as amended by this Act, it is the sense of Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(c) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance under section 212(a), as amended by this Act, the Secretary of Commerce shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

Mr. TRAFICANT (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I too am concerned about zebra mussels and oyster diseases. I certainly wish and hope that I never get any of them.

My amendment is a little bit different. It deals with a buy-American

provision. Just briefly, 90 percent of American workers, according to an analysis performed by the Philadelphia Inquirer, 90 percent, by major print media, it says that 90 percent of American workers are worried about losing their jobs, their homes, and maybe their pensions. They have never seen so much fear in the workplace.

They also said for every \$1 of income there is \$2 of debt for American workers. Individual bankruptcies hit an all-time record, an all-time record level. Credit card debt is at an all-time level, manufacturing jobs continue to leave, and the trade deficit with Japan and China is so much we cannot count it.

So my amendment basically says when expending the dollars under this Sea Grant Program, they shall comply with the buy-American laws and do everything possible competitively to buy American-made goods and products, and there shall be a notice made to recipients of assistance of the concerns of Congress, and their encouragement of them to buy American.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an "aye" vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any further debate on the amendment?

If not, the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. TRAFICANT].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments?

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SHADEGG

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SHADEGG: At the end of the amendment, add the following new title:

TITLE II—GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN PREVENTION ACT

SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.

This title may be cited as the "Government Shutdown Prevention Act".

SEC. 202. CONTINUING FUNDING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If any regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 1998 does not become law prior to the beginning of fiscal year 1998 or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations is not in effect, there is appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and out of applicable corporate or other revenues, receipts, and funds, such sums as may be necessary to continue any program, project, or activity for which funds were provided in fiscal year 1997.

(b) LEVEL OF FUNDING.—Appropriations and funds made available, and authority granted, for a program, project, or activity for fiscal year 1998 pursuant to this title shall be at 100 percent of the rate of operations that was provided for the program, project, or activity in fiscal year 1997 in the corresponding regular appropriation Act for fiscal year 1997.

(c) PERIOD OF AVAILABILITY.—Appropriations and funds made available, and authority granted, for fiscal year 1998 pursuant to this title for a program, project, or activity shall be available for the period beginning with the first day of a lapse in appropriations and ending with the earlier of—

(1) the date on which the applicable regular appropriation bill for fiscal year 1998 becomes law (whether or not that law provides for that program, project, or activity) or a

continuing resolution making appropriations becomes law, as the case may be; or

(2) the last day of fiscal year 1998.

SEC. 203. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—An appropriation of funds made available, or authority granted, for a program, project, or activity for fiscal year 1998 pursuant to this title shall be made available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act for fiscal year 1997, including all of the terms and conditions and the apportionment schedule imposed with respect to the appropriation made or funds made available for fiscal year 1997 or authority granted for the program, project, or activity under current law.

(b) EXTENT AND MANNER.—Appropriations made by this title shall be available to the extent and in the manner which would be provided by the pertinent appropriations Act.

SEC. 204. COVERAGE.

Appropriations and funds made available, and authority granted, for any program, project, or activity for fiscal year 1998 pursuant to this title shall cover all obligations or expenditures incurred for that program, project, or activity during the portion of fiscal year 1998 for which this title applies to that program, project, or activity.

SEC. 205. EXPENDITURES.

Expenditures made for a program, project, or activity for fiscal year 1998 pursuant to this title shall be charged to the applicable appropriation, fund, or authorization whenever a regular appropriation bill or a joint resolution making continuing appropriations until the end of fiscal year 1998 providing for that program, project, or activity for that period becomes law.

SEC. 206. INITIATING OR RESUMING A PROGRAM, PROJECT, OR ACTIVITY.

No appropriation or funds made available or authority granted pursuant to this title shall be used to initiate or resume any program, project, or activity for which appropriations, funds, or other authority were not available during fiscal year 1997.

SEC. 207. PROTECTION OF OTHER OBLIGATIONS.

Nothing in this title shall be construed to effect Government obligations mandated by other law, including obligations with respect to Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, and veterans benefits.

SEC. 208. DEFINITION.

In this title, the term "regular appropriation bill" means any annual appropriation bill making appropriations, otherwise making funds available, or granting authority, for any of the following categories of programs, projects, and activities:

- (1) Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies programs.
- (2) The Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies.
- (3) The Department of Defense.
- (4) The government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of the District.
- (5) The Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies.
- (6) The Departments of Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices.
- (7) Energy and water development.
- (8) Foreign assistance and related programs.
- (9) The Department of the Interior and related agencies.
- (10) Military construction.
- (11) The Department of Transportation and related agencies.

(12) The Treasury Department, the U.S. Postal Service, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies.

(13) The Legislative Branch.

Before section 1, insert the following:

TITLE I—NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. SHADEGG (during the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I object that this amendment is not germane to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] reserve his point of order, or is the gentleman from California making his point of order at this time?

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman makes a point of order that the amendment is not germane.

Does the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] wish to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. SHADEGG. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] is recognized on the point of order.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me this is in fact very germane. It has to do with the operations of the Federal Government. It is clear to me we do not need to see another Federal Government shutdown. It is important that we take steps now to ensure that Federal employees not lose their jobs, and that we not go through that scenario again.

This is a proposal to assure the American people that we do not once again face the prospect of shutting down the Government, and to assure that neither side blackmails the other to ensure or to force increased spending. It seems to me that is germane to this measure. It seems to me it will place this Congress and the U.S. Government in the position that we all agree it should be in.

The President has said that we should never again shut down the Government. He made that statement both in January, twice in January, and once again in March of this year. This measure, I believe, is germane in that it assures that Federal employees, veterans, Social Security recipients, all of those who depend upon the services of the Federal Government, would not lose their jobs.

In addition, Mr. Chairman, it assures that we will not face a situation where one side can blackmail the other side into increasing more spending. It is identical to the provision which was offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] last week, and it takes important steps that this Government needs to take to assure that

operations continue when we reach the end of the fiscal year.

It seems to me that if that is not germane to this legislation and the operations of this Government, then it ought to be germane and it ought to be allowed to have a vote at this particular time. I would urge that it is germane, I would urge that it is important that we make it clear to the people of America that we will not ever again shut down the Government, nor will we allow one side to threaten the other side in a blackmail.

It is quite evident that the President wants to use the threat of a shutdown in this Congress in order to force increased spending. I think that is inappropriate. This is a proposal offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] to accomplish a very important task for this Nation. It seems to me essential that we act upon it and that we act upon it now.

Whether we send it to the President as a freestanding bill or we send it to the President attached to this measure, it is important that we assure all of those who rely upon Government services that spending will continue, that certain minimal services will be preserved.

It is also important for those who pay the tax bill that we not allow spending to get out of hand, and that we not allow one side to blackmail the other into spending more money with the threat of a Government shutdown hanging over our heads. It seems to me clearly germane to this issue and very important that we act on this, and that we act on it now. What we were seeking to do last year was serious.

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Chairman, I call for regular order and a point of order. This is an authorization bill, not an appropriations bill.

Mr. GEKAS. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FARR of California. It has to do with sea grants.

The CHAIRMAN. The Members will suspend.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] should confine his remarks simply to the question of the point of order. With that admonition, the gentleman may proceed.

Mr. GEKAS. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] wish to be heard on the germaneness point of order?

Mr. GEKAS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS].

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Chairman, we have had a recurring battle over the years as to whether or not this type of amendment would be germane to a subject like the one that is presently on the floor. We are trying to convince the Parliamentarian and the Speaker's office that when we talk about a matter that has to do with a continuation of Government, to prevent shutdown of

Government by a transition type of mechanism that we are constantly proposing, that we are, in effect, allowing this measure today to actually go into effect, because if we do have to shut down Government, then this measure and all its sister measures will be of no avail. They will be of no force, because during the shutdown of Government they will go out of existence.

That is why we say that a motion, an amendment that would continue Government, prevent Government shutdown, facilitates this legislation, the subject matter that is on the floor here. Although it has to do with perhaps a budget concept, the very existence of the agency that would be promulgating and continuing the work of the subject matter of this would be in jeopardy if the Government shuts down. That is why we feel this is germane.

The CHAIRMAN. If no other Member desires to argue on the point of order, the Chair is prepared to rule.

Does the gentleman from California [Mr. FARR] simply wish to submit the issue to the Chair with respect to germaneness?

Mr. FARR of California. I do, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment involves legislative jurisdictions and subject matters, to wit, appropriations, beyond those in the pending bill, and pursues purposes different from those pursued in the bill. The amendment is not germane. The point of order is sustained.

□ 1215

Are there further amendments to the bill?

If not, the question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having resumed the chair, Mr. ROGAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 437) to reauthorize the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 164, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute adopted by the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

Mr. SAXTON. 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 422, nays 3, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 208]

YEAS—422

Abercrombie	Costello	Goodling
Ackerman	Cox	Gordon
Aderholt	Coyne	Goss
Allen	Cramer	Graham
Archer	Crane	Granger
Armey	Crapo	Green
Bachus	Cubin	Greenwood
Baesler	Cummings	Gutierrez
Baker	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Baldacci	Danner	Hall (OH)
Ballenger	Davis (FL)	Hall (TX)
Barcia	Davis (IL)	Hamilton
Barr	Davis (VA)	Hansen
Barrett (NE)	Deal	Harman
Barrett (WI)	DeFazio	Hastert
Bartlett	DeGette	Hastings (FL)
Bass	Delahunt	Hastings (WA)
Bateman	DeLauro	Hayworth
Becerra	DeLay	Hefner
Bentsen	Dellums	Hergert
Bereuter	Deutsch	Hill
Berman	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Berry	Dickey	Hilliard
Billbray	Dicks	Hinchee
Billirakis	Dingell	Hinojosa
Bishop	Dixon	Hobson
Blagojevich	Doggett	Hoekstra
Bliley	Dooley	Holden
Blumenauer	Doolittle	Hooley
Blunt	Doyle	Horn
Boehlert	Dreier	Hostettler
Boehner	Duncan	Houghton
Bonilla	Dunn	Hoyer
Bonior	Edwards	Hulshof
Bono	Ehlers	Hunter
Borski	Ehrlich	Hutchinson
Boswell	Emerson	Hyde
Boucher	Engel	Inglis
Boyd	English	Istook
Brady	Ensign	Jackson (IL)
Brown (CA)	Eshoo	Jackson-Lee
Brown (FL)	Etheridge	(TX)
Brown (OH)	Evans	Jefferson
Bryant	Everett	Jenkins
Bunning	Ewing	John
Burr	Farr	Johnson (CT)
Burton	Fattah	Johnson (WI)
Buyer	Fawell	Johnson, E. B.
Callahan	Fazio	Johnson, Sam
Calvert	Filner	Jones
Camp	Flake	Kanjorski
Campbell	Foglietta	Kaptur
Canady	Foley	Kasich
Cannon	Forbes	Kelly
Capps	Ford	Kennedy (MA)
Cardin	Fowler	Kennedy (RI)
Carson	Fox	Kennelly
Castle	Frank (MA)	Kildee
Chabot	Franks (NJ)	Kilpatrick
Chambliss	Frelinghuysen	Kim
Chenoweth	Frost	Kind (WI)
Christensen	Furse	King (NY)
Clay	Galleghy	Kingston
Clayton	Ganske	Klecza
Clement	Gejdenson	Klink
Clyburn	Gekas	Klug
Coble	Gephardt	Knollenberg
Coburn	Gibbons	Kolbe
Collins	Gilchrest	Kucinich
Combest	Gillmor	LaFalce
Condit	Gilman	LaHood
Conyers	Gonzalez	Lampson
Cook	Goode	Lantos
Cooksey	Goodlatte	Latham

LaTourette	Oxley	Sisisky
Lazio	Packard	Skaggs
Leach	Pallone	Skeen
Levin	Pappas	Skelton
Lewis (CA)	Parker	Slaughter
Lewis (GA)	Pascrell	Smith (OR)
Lewis (KY)	Pastor	Smith (TX)
Linder	Paxon	Smith, Adam
Livingston	Payne	Smith, Linda
LoBiondo	Pease	Snowbarger
Lofgren	Pelosi	Snyder
Lowe	Peterson (MN)	Solomon
Lucas	Peterson (PA)	Souder
Luther	Petri	Spence
Maloney (CT)	Pickering	Spratt
Maloney (NY)	Pickett	Stabenow
Manton	Pitts	Stark
Manzullo	Pomeroy	Stearns
Markey	Porter	Stenholm
Martinez	Portman	Stokes
Mascara	Poshard	Strickland
Matsui	Price (NC)	Stump
McCarthy (MO)	Pryce (OH)	Stupak
McCarthy (NY)	Quinn	Sununu
McCollum	Radanovich	Talent
McCrery	Rahall	Tanner
McDade	Ramstad	Tauscher
McDermott	Rangel	Tauzin
McGovern	Redmond	Taylor (NC)
McHale	Regula	Thomas
McHugh	Reyes	Thompson
McInnis	Riggs	Thornberry
McIntosh	Riley	Thune
McIntyre	Rivers	Thurman
McKeon	Rodriguez	Tiahrt
McKinney	Roemer	Tierney
McNulty	Rogan	Torres
Meehan	Rogers	Torres
Meek	Rohrabacher	Towns
Menendez	Ros-Lehtinen	Trafficant
Metcalf	Rothman	Turner
Mica	Roukema	Upton
Millender-	Roybal-Allard	Velazquez
McDonald	Royce	Vento
Miller (FL)	Rush	Visclosky
Minge	Ryuan	Walsh
Mink	Sabo	Wamp
Moakley	Salmon	Waters
Molinari	Sanchez	Watkins
Mollohan	Sanders	Watt (NC)
Moran (KS)	Sandlin	Watts (OK)
Moran (VA)	Sanford	Waxman
Morella	Sawyer	Weldon (FL)
Murtha	Saxton	Weldon (PA)
Myrick	Scarborough	Weller
Nadler	Schaefer, Dan	Wexler
Neal	Schaffer, Bob	White
Nethercutt	Schumer	Whitfield
Neumann	Scott	Wicker
Ney	Sensenbrenner	Wise
Northup	Serrano	Wolf
Norwood	Sessions	Woolsey
Nussle	Shadegg	Wynn
Oberstar	Shaw	Yates
Obey	Shays	Young (AK)
Olver	Sherman	Young (FL)
Ortiz	Shimkus	
Owens	Shuster	

NAYS—3

Hefley Paul Taylor (MS)

NOT VOTING—9

Andrews	Lipinski	Schiff
Barton	Miller (CA)	Smith (MI)
Largent	Pombo	Smith (NJ)

□ 1236

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

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 437, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?
There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 208, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the pending business is the question of the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 366, noes 50, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 209]

AYES—366

Ackerman	Combest	Gilchrest
Aderholt	Condit	Gillmor
Allen	Conyers	Gilman
Archer	Cook	Gonzalez
Bachus	Cooksey	Goode
Baesler	Costello	Goodlatte
Baker	Cox	Goodling
Baldacci	Coyne	Goss
Ballenger	Cramer	Graham
Barcia	Crane	Granger
Barr	Crapo	Green
Barrett (NE)	Cubin	Greenwood
Barrett (WI)	Cummings	Gutierrez
Bartlett	Cunningham	Gutknecht
Bass	Danner	Hall (OH)
Bateman	Davis (FL)	Hall (TX)
Becerra	Davis (VA)	Hamilton
Bentsen	Deal	Hansen
Bereuter	DeGette	Harman
Berman	Delahunt	Hastert
Berry	DeLauro	Hastings (WA)
Bilbray	DeLay	Hayworth
Bilirakis	Dellums	Hefner
Bishop	Deutsch	Herger
Blagojevich	Diaz-Balart	Hinchey
Biley	Dickey	Hinojosa
Blumenauer	Dicks	Hobson
Blunt	Dingell	Hoekstra
Boehler	Dixon	Holden
Boehner	Doggett	Hooley
Bonilla	Dooley	Horn
Bonior	Doolittle	Hosettler
Bono	Doyle	Houghton
Boswell	Dreier	Hoyer
Boucher	Duncan	Hunter
Boyd	Dunn	Hutchinson
Brady	Edwards	Hyde
Brown (FL)	Ehlers	Inglis
Bryant	Ehrlich	Istook
Bunning	Emerson	Jackson (IL)
Burton	Engel	Jackson-Lee
Buyer	Eshoo	(TX)
Callahan	Evans	Jefferson
Calvert	Everett	Jenkins
Camp	Ewing	John
Campbell	Farr	Johnson (CT)
Canady	Fattah	Johnson (WI)
Cannon	Flake	Johnson, E. B.
Capps	Foglietta	Johnson, Sam
Cardin	Foley	Jones
Carson	Forbes	Kanjorski
Castle	Ford	Kaptur
Chabot	Fowler	Kasich
Chambliss	Frank (MA)	Kennedy (MA)
Christensen	Franks (NJ)	Kennedy (RI)
Clayton	Frelinghuysen	Kennelly
Clement	Furse	Kildee
Clyburn	Galleghy	Kilpatrick
Coble	Ganske	Kim
Collins	Gejdenson	Kind (WI)

King (NY)	Norwood	Shadegg
Kingston	Nussle	Shaw
Kleczka	Obey	Shays
Klink	Olver	Sherman
Klug	Ortiz	Shimkus
Knollenberg	Owens	Shuster
Kolbe	Oxley	Sisisky
LaFalce	Packard	Skaggs
LaHood	Pallone	Skeen
Lampson	Pappas	Skelton
Lantos	Parker	Slaughter
Latham	Pastor	Smith (MI)
LaTourette	Paul	Smith (OR)
Lazio	Paxon	Smith (TX)
Leach	Payne	Smith, Adam
Levin	Pease	Snowbarger
Lewis (KY)	Pelosi	Snyder
Linder	Peterson (MN)	Souder
Livingston	Peterson (PA)	Spence
Lofgren	Petri	Spratt
Lowe	Pickering	Stabenow
Luther	Pitts	Stark
Maloney (CT)	Pomeroy	Stenholm
Manton	Porter	Stokes
Markey	Portman	Strickland
Martinez	Price (NC)	Stump
Mascara	Pryce (OH)	Talent
Matsui	Quinn	Tanner
McCarthy (MO)	Radanovich	Tauscher
McCarthy (NY)	Rahall	Tauzin
McCollum	Rangel	Taylor (NC)
McCrery	Redmond	Thomas
McDade	Regula	Thornberry
McGovern	Reyes	Thune
McHale	Riggs	Thurman
McHugh	Riley	Tierney
McInnis	Rivers	Torres
McIntosh	Rodriguez	Towns
McIntyre	Roemer	Trafficant
McKeon	Rogan	Turner
McKinney	Rogers	Upton
Meehan	Rohrabacher	Velazquez
Meek	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Menendez	Rothman	Watkins
Metcalf	Roukema	Watt (NC)
Mica	Roybal-Allard	Watts (OK)
Millender-	Royce	Waxman
McDonald	Rush	Weldon (FL)
Miller (FL)	Miller (FL)	Weldon (PA)
Minge	Mink	Wexler
Mink	Moakley	Weygand
Moakley	Molinari	White
Molinari	Mollohan	Whitfield
Mollohan	Moran (KS)	Wicker
Moran (KS)	Moran (VA)	Wise
Moran (VA)	Morella	Wolf
Morella	Myrick	Woolsey
Murtha	Nadler	Wynn
Myrick	Neal	Yates
Nadler	Nethercutt	Young (AK)
Neal	Neumann	Young (FL)
Nethercutt	Northup	
Ney		
Northup		
Norwood		
Nussle		
Oberstar		
Obey		
Olver		
Ortiz		
Owens		

NOES—50

Abercrombie	Gibbons	Pickett
Borski	Hastings (FL)	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Hefley	Ramstad
Brown (OH)	Hilleary	Sabo
Chenoweth	Hilliary	Schaffer, Bob
Clay	Hulshof	Smith, Linda
Coburn	Kelly	Solomon
Davis (IL)	Kucinich	Stearns
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Stupak
English	LoBiondo	Sununu
Ensign	Maloney (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Etheridge	McDermott	Thompson
Fazio	McNulty	Tiahrt
Filner	Metcalf	Wamp
Fox	Ney	Waters
Frost	Oberstar	Weller
Gephardt	Pascrell	

NOT VOTING—18

Andrews	Gordon	Miller (CA)
Armey	Hill	Murtha
Barton	Largent	Pombo
Burr	Lewis (CA)	Schiff
Fawell	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
Gekas	Lucas	Walsh

□ 1254

So the Journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call votes No. 204, 205, and 206 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on rollcall No. 204, "yes" on rollcall No. 205, and "yes" on rollcall No. 206.

GOP TAX RELIEF PLAN PUTS MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES FIRST

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the Democrats today seem to be characteristically void of facts and rich in rhetoric in their deliveries of one-minutes.

Under the Republican tax bill, the income level of \$75,000 per household or less than \$75,000 is going to get 76 percent of the tax relief. Families with incomes over \$200,000 get 1.2 percent. I do not understand how they can say that is giving more taxes to the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, in 1992 the President ran on the platform of middle-class tax cuts but instead, as President, in 1993 passed the largest tax increase in history, including the largest-ever increase in welfare. But after a lot of debate, welfare was reformed. Today the number of dependents, people who are dependent on government, has decreased by 15 percent. Yet, the President wants to expand welfare and not give middle-class tax relief.

What I am saying is he wants to give a \$500-per-child tax credit to people who are on welfare and not give it to 11 million middle-class children who need the money very, very desperately for school and education and shelter.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this information from the Committee on Ways and Means:

The following table shows the amount of tax relief received by people of various income categories over a 5-year period, according to data provided by the Joint Committee on Taxation.

Income level	Tax relief	Percent of tax relief
Under \$75,000	— \$89.0 billion	76.4
\$75,000 to \$100,000	— 19.3 billion	16.6
\$100,000 to \$200,000	— 6.7 billion	5.8
\$200,000+	1.4 billion	1.2

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members are recognized for 5 minutes each:

THE DETROIT NEWSPAPER STRIKE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, from grocery stores in Kansas City to casinos in

Las Vegas, from the strawberry fields in California to the K-Mart stores in North Carolina, to the poultry workers who are working across the South, working people across this country are speaking out for justice, and unions are their voices.

There is something special that is happening in the country that a lot of the media is missing. Working people's wages and benefits have been eroding now since 1979. Eighty percent of the American people have only gotten 2 percent of the income increases since 1979, and they are finding out that what made the middle class and what made people strong in this country during the 1940's and the 1950's was joining together and banding together so they could get a decent reward and wage for their work.

This weekend, we will again hear those strong voices loud and clear from Detroit. At least 50,000 workers, their families, and supporters are expected to participate in Action Motown '97, which is a mobilization solidarity for the Detroit community, locked out newspaper workers, and union members.

I am going to be there, and we will be speaking out to workers, to the labor movement in our community and against the management of the Detroit News and Free Press. The News and Free Press have locked out nearly 2,000 hard-working men and women since February of this year, and these workers sought to resolve a 2-year labor dispute by unconditionally offering to return to work.

How were they treated when they tried to jump-start contract talks and tried to return to work? They were locked out, replaced and told to go home.

□ 1300

It is clear to me that the News and the Free Press are willing to lose millions of dollars in an attempt to break the unions. How clear is it? Their combined circulation is down 286,000 readers. Despite huge ad rate discounts, 1,500 advertisers have stayed away from the papers, causing a 24-percent dip in advertising revenue.

Yet the most startling fact is not statistics but a quote made 1 month after the newspaper workers took a stand for justice by Detroit News editor and publisher Robert Giles. He said, "We're going to hire a whole new work force and go on without unions, or they can surrender unconditionally and salvage what they can."

Does that sound like someone who is willing to bargain in good faith? Despite a 1994 Free Press editorial, which stated, "The U.S. Senate should approve a bill that would prohibit companies from hiring permanent replacements for striking workers. The right to strike is essential if workers are to gain and preserve wages."

That was the Free Press in 1994. It seems clear that the hiring of permanent nonunion replacement workers

has been a newspaper goal all along, because the Free Press does not practice what it preaches. The Free Press and its editor Joe Stroud reneged on their editorial and took a gutless way out, turning their backs on these workers. This is what they said in an editorial that was written in an about-face in 1995, and I quote. They said, "We intend to exercise our legal right to hire replacement workers."

I think Cardinal Adam J. Maida of Detroit best put it when he said, "The hiring of permanent replacement workers is not an acceptable solution. If striking workers are threatened with being permanently replaced, this practice seems to undermine the legitimate purpose of the union and to destroy the possibility of collective bargaining."

The News and the Free Press are owned by two of the biggest conglomerates in the world, Gannett and Knight-Ridder, who have deep pockets and are willing to lose millions of dollars to set an example in Detroit. They are trying to break the backs of unions and deprive 2,000 workers of their jobs and their families of sustenance. Their actions are unfair, they are unjust, they are illegal, and we will be marching as we marched in Decatur for workers in that city, as we marched for strawberry workers in California. We will be in Detroit because many of our parents and grandparents fought too hard and too long for the gains that unions have made, for the 40-hour workweek, for pensions, for health care benefits, you name it.

I could go on for 10 minutes here with all the things that unions have brought America, not just people who belong to unions. Those benefits benefited everybody in our society. Now they are being taken away one by one, piece by piece by conglomerates and multinationals like Knight-Ridder and Gannett. We are going to be there, I encourage everyone to be there, I encourage everyone to join Action! Motown '97 this weekend.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GEKAS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

RESOLUTION APOLOGIZING FOR SLAVERY

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

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, last week, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 96. This is a resolution that apologizes for slavery in the United States. It is rather simple. It is only one sentence long. Let me read it:

Resolved by the House of Representatives that the Congress apologizes to African-

Americans whose ancestors suffered as slaves under the Constitution and the laws of the United States until 1865.

That is simply what it says. It is a very simple idea. The Congress apologizes. It is a powerful message.

When a brother wrongs a brother, he apologizes. That is the foundation for beginning again. That is the price for restoring lost trust. This is the only way to start over. It is a simple gesture. It carries deep meaning. And it is the right thing to do.

When an institution wrongs a people, so it is again the right thing to do. In the name of all Catholics, Pope John Paul II apologized for violence during the 16th century Counter-Reformation and he asked for forgiveness.

Forty years after the Holocaust, the legislature of East Germany apologized for the atrocities committed against the Jews.

Just last month, British Prime Minister Tony Blair apologized for the failure of his country to fully respond to the thousands of deaths during the Irish potato famine of the mid-19th century.

It has been 134 years since slavery ended. Since that time, Congress has taken proud strides forward, done some wonderful things, including civil rights laws. But it is not enough.

Look around. The effects still linger today. Through my work as chairman of the former House Select Committee on Hunger and through my efforts to improve the lives of America's poor, I have seen the effects firsthand. We as a nation must do more. This is not a political gesture, it is not a partisan gesture, it is a very simple gesture and it certainly is the right thing.

The slaves and slave holders are long gone. No one alive today is responsible for slavery. No one alive today was shackled by the chains of slavery in America. Indeed, most Americans are the descendants of people who came to the United States after slavery ended.

All of us today, white and black, live in the shadow of our past. African-Americans today still suffer from the lingering effects. We all pay the price of slavery.

The hatred and racial divisions springing from slavery are very much alive. Let us take this step to bury that hatred with the bones of the slaves and the slave holders.

No Member of Congress today voted on measures to perpetuate slavery. But the Congress as an institution does bear responsibility. The laws we passed ignored, even encouraged slavery. Our Constitution, the foundation for the Congress, and our Government even declared at one time that a black man was only three-fifths of a person.

Congress is a great institution. It is the most respected deliberative body in the world. At least three times in recent years, Congress formally apologized.

In 1988, it apologized to the Japanese-Americans who were interned in the United States during World War II.

In 1993, Congress offered a formal apology to native Hawaiians for the role the United States and U.S. citizens played in the overthrow of the government of the Kingdom of Hawaii 100 years earlier.

In 1990, Congress apologized to uranium miners, people affected by nuclear tests in Nevada, and their families.

An apology by Congress is rare, it is special, but it is not without precedence. Apologizing is symbolic, but it has a great meaning for those who are apologizing and it has power for those who are wronged.

Why apologize to just African-Americans for slavery? What about all the other people who have been wronged by laws passed by the Congress? The wrongs against African-Americans are clear to everyone. The consequences are severe. Maybe we have wronged others. Maybe an apology to them is due. I do not know. That is another issue. I do know that we need to apologize to African-Americans.

Many people have told me that apologizing is an empty, meaningless gesture. If it was so meaningless, why has the resolution erupted a fire storm of controversy throughout this Nation? If apologizing were so easy, then why is this resolution so difficult?

No, it is not easy to apologize. It is the right thing to do. Today 134 years later, it is not too late, but let us wait no longer. We are a nation of immigrants. Those who came as free men went in one direction. Those who came from slave ships, another. If we are to travel towards a common future, we owe it to our children to clearly mark that the early fork in the road was the wrong way.

This is a simple resolution. It simply reads:

Resolved by the House of Representatives that the Congress apologizes to African-Americans whose ancestors suffered as slaves under the Constitution and laws of the United States until 1865.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing worse than committing an injustice. There is perhaps only one thing that makes a mistake last forever, and that Mr. Speaker is the failure to offer an apology and to ask for forgiveness. We cannot make amends to our ancestors who were slaves. We cannot right all the wrongs of the past which have contributed to racism and economic injustice. But, we can say that this Nation is very sorry for the saddest chapter in its history.

One of the most profound changes in the history of this society occurred more than 100 years ago. The Civil War rocked the roots of this Nation. The war tested the resolve of the American people to form a more perfect union. It brought an end to slavery—the curse that robbed thousands of Americans of their basic human rights and sabotaged the fundamental premise of equality to which every person is entitled.

The end of slavery in the 19th century and the establishment of the Civil Rights Act in the 20th century were turning points in the history of this Nation. Now, as we approach the 21st century it is time to move further ahead in our quest for a truly democratic society.

On Saturday, President Clinton gave a major address on the race problem that plagues our Nation. In this spirit we embrace the Resolution to Apologize for Slavery. May we begin now to chart the next course toward the achievement of a truly equal, truly color-blind society.

Mr. Speaker, I join other colleagues in co-sponsoring the House concurrent resolution to apologize to all African-Americans whose ancestors suffered as slaves. This apology is long overdue, but it is never too late to do what is right.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE "MARV" TEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOB SCHAFFER of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the life and work of Mr. George "Marv" Teal. Marv was born July 4, 1943, to Genevieve O'Brien Teal, while his father, George Vincent Teal, served in the Philippines during World War II. As a boy he thought it was wonderful that the city threw him a big birthday party each year with a parade and fireworks. George was tagged with the nickname "Marv" in high school and it stuck with him throughout his life.

Marv died May 21, 1997 in Greeley, CO, where he and his family settled 15 years ago. He was laid to rest at Fort Logan National Cemetery in Denver on May 27, 1997. He was married to Kathy for 29 years. Together they raised three children: A son, George Patrick Teal who is a first lieutenant in the U.S. Army serving as a special projects officer. He has two daughters, Suellen and Kathleen, who are both computer technologists. He also has a granddaughter Laurel, who will be 2 in August. Marv and Kathy raised a lovely family and supported many community activities.

A staunch Republican, he spent many years in leadership roles as precinct chairman, district captain, Weld County vice chairman, county and State assembly delegate, and of course as delegate to the Colorado Fourth Congressional District. He also served as election judge and canvass board member. He contributed his efforts to individual campaigns over the years and was an effective strategist helpful in planning the time lines necessary for the success of those campaigns. George was always to be seen at late night committee meetings, at county and State assemblies and at busy intersections waving campaign signs. There was never a time when a call for help went unheeded. There was also never a time when he expected to be recognized for his efforts. Marv did what he did out of principle. Many people have been influenced by this wise, experienced man. He knew the secret of multiplying his influence by encouraging others of like mind to take leadership in the public realm.

Marv was a quiet man, respectful of others, slow to anger and quick to forgive. He loved reading, flying, computer programming, and bicycling. His proudest accomplishments were of course his children. His son George followed through on the love of country Marv tried to instill by serving in the military and his daughters both followed his love of computers.

That was in fact Marv's first love. After graduating from St. Francis High School in Wheaton, IL, in 1961, he attended a technical school specializing in computer programming. Having his daughters become adept computer specialists was a definite source of fatherly pride. Marv came back to the computer field toward the end of his working career after spending many years in sales.

As a young man Marv was drafted into the Army in 1965 during the first big draft of the Vietnam war. He felt privileged to serve his country as his father and his grandfather had done before him, and he thought it was his patriotic duty. He excelled in turbine generator school at Fort Belvoir, VA, graduating first in his class. He never got to use his mechanics training, though, because he was never sent to Vietnam. Instead he served out the rest of his time in Fort Campbell, KY as a company clerk, supply officer, and finished his last 9 months of service in his favorite duty, as a military policeman.

Marv spent the rest of his life focused on his wife, children, and community. For 10 years he and Kathy were team leaders for World Wide Marriage Encounter weekends for the Catholic church. They were privileged to coordinate more than 60 weekends to help couples make their good marriages into great committed relationships. Marv and Kathy facilitated marriage preparation classes for their church. Marv was also instrumental in forming the Rite of Christian Initiative for Adults at St. Mary's Parish in Greeley. He demonstrated his love of teaching and for young people as a confirmation teacher for 9 years. He was also a board member of Habitat for Humanity and Citizens for Responsible Government.

Marv understood the meaning of the grassroots political process and exemplified it daily. It is people like Marv who contribute to the greatness of America, the behind-the-scenes hard work essential to our communities and the make-up of the character of this great Nation. I am privileged to have known him and experienced the results of his efforts. They will not go unappreciated. His memory and the influence he had on us and our Nation will far outlive his life. Each time we celebrate our independence and the freedoms we too often take for granted, we need to remember the contributions of people like Marv.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit for the RECORD a short poem that Marv considered his statement of his life's philosophy and indeed it was the best description of his life as a devoted father, a husband, and American.

DESIDERATA

(By Max Ehrmann)

Go placidly amid the noise and haste, and remember what peace there may be in silence. As far as possible without surrender be on good terms with all persons. Speak your truth quietly and clearly; and listen to others, even the dull and ignorant; they too have their story. Avoid loud and aggressive persons, they are vexations of the spirit.

If you compare yourself with others, you may become vain and bitter; for there will always be greater and lesser persons than yourself.

Enjoy your achievements as well as your plans. Keep interested in your own career, however humble; it is a real possession in the changing fortunes of time.

Exercise caution in your business affairs; for the world is full of trickery. But let this not blind you to what virtue there is; many persons strive for high ideals; and everywhere life is full of heroism.

Be yourself. Especially do not feign affection. Neither be cynical about love; for in the face of all aridity and disenchantment it is as perennial as the grass.

Take kindly the counsel of the years, gracefully surrendering the things of youth.

Nurture strength of spirit to shield you in sudden misfortune. But do not distress yourself with dark imaginings. Many fears are born of fatigue and loneliness.

Beyond a wholesome discipline, be gentle with yourself. You are a child of the universe, no less than the trees and the stars; you have a right to be here. And whether or not it is clear to you, no doubt the universe is unfolding as it should.

Therefore be at peace with God, whatever you conceive Him to be, and whatever your labors and aspirations, in the noisy confusion of life keep peace with your soul.

With all its sham, drudgery, and broken dreams, it is still a beautiful world. Be cheerful. Strive to be happy.

ONGOING TOBACCO INDUSTRY NEGOTIATIONS

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

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, the negotiations that are going on at the present time with the tobacco industry, they are requesting that they be excused from punitive damages.

I want to point out to my colleagues that the tobacco industry for 4 decades has misled and deceived the American people about their product. They have lied to the Congress, and they have kept documents secret. Last week we revealed documents that had not been public before from the Liggett Tobacco Co. where they had an attorney-client privilege to try to keep these documents from the public where they knew about a safer cigarette but did not want to make a safer cigarette because their lawyers said that would mean that the cigarette they were already making was unsafe and they would be presumably admitting that.

□ 1315

They refused to turn over to medical people information about the harm from cigarettes because they were fearful of the liability that might attach to them.

Now those documents are simply the tip of the iceberg. There are over 150,000 documents that have claimed to be attorney client privilege. The attorney client privilege will not shield documents if there is fraud or criminal conduct involved, and I believe that if these documents become public, they may well lead to criminal charges being brought.

One of the reasons the tobacco industry is so anxious for a settlement is that one of the terms of their settlement is that these documents would be kept secret forever.

Now if these documents became public, we would know whether there ought to be punitive damages in some of these lawsuits. How can we agree in any negotiation to excuse the tobacco industry from punitive damages without knowing all the facts?

So I would hope that those people that are sitting down and discussing what might be a recommendation to the Congress for settlement of a lot of these issues regarding tobacco will not recommend to us to excuse and forgive the tobacco companies for any actions they may have undertaken that would amount to punitive damages before we know fully what actions they have been engaged in. What we do know is that for four decades they have acted in a way that we would never accept from any other business or corporation in this country. They have manufactured a product and sold it knowing it is harmful and claiming the contrary to be true. They have sold a product that is addictive, and they knew that to be the case, and they denied it. They were targeting our kids, and then they denied it. What are punitive damages all about except to punish people who have acted wrongly? And if the tobacco industry has not acted wrongly in these last four decades, what industry could possibly be accused of acting more wrongly?

I hope they do not come back and recommend to us that we forgive the tobacco industry for their wrongdoing and not hold them accountable if in fact punitive damages are warranted.

GIVE TAX RELIEF TO THE PEOPLE PAYING THE TAXES

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

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, we have legislation coming before this body that would give tax relief back to the American people.

My father took home 85 percent of his paycheck. My daughters are scheduled to take home 10 percent of their

paycheck at the current spending and the current tax rate on the American people. My brother takes home today only about 45 percent of his paycheck. This is not a legacy that we want to leave to our children. In the tax relief balanced budget plan that is coming before this body this body gives back 97 percent of tax relief to those earning less than \$100,000.

Mr. Speaker, \$100,000 is a lot of money for a lot of people, but it also gives 72 percent of the tax relief for families earning between \$20,000 and \$75,000. Our colleagues on the other side, there are those that voted against a balanced budget, those who voted against welfare reform. What we call the liberal faction and leadership of the Democrat Party would say that we are giving only a tax break for the rich. If you take a look at Karl Marx's Communist manifesto, the class warfare, the ideals of union from control of private property right on down the line is class warfare and controlling the American people. What we are trying to do is give tax relief to the American people that are paying taxes.

We went through a pretty violent debate in this body on welfare reform, but yet my colleagues on the other side that support a socialist model for this country would have us believe that people that do not pay any taxes should get back tax relief. Well, we had a welfare reform package. What this package does is the hard-working people that are projected to only get 10 percent of their dollars in their paycheck have some tax relief, and that is what is focused.

If we take a look at Japan, 1 in 11 workers works for the government; in France, 1 in 4. Now you see what kind of government that was elected in France over these last few weeks. France is controlled now by the socialists and the Communists that support big government and control of private property and on down the line. When they talk about Mr. Sweeney and the AFL-CIO, who do they represent? They represent government workers, and I would tell Mr. Sweeney that if he would support the Government officials and government workers necessary to do the legitimate works of the Constitution and this country, he would find a lot of Republican support. But to go out and fight for additional power for bigger government, for higher taxes, he is going to meet resistance.

And my colleagues on the other side just do not get the message that we want lower taxes on the American people to stimulate growth, to put dollars in their pocket, not the Federal Government. If we take a look at the legitimate functions of this country, then we supply the workers to do that, then I think we can come up with tax relief for all. Ninety-seven percent, 97 percent of the tax relief, goes to families earning less than \$100,000; 72 percent less than \$75,000, down to \$20,000, and those that do not get or pay taxes do not get tax relief. That is a form of

welfare. They get all of the other benefits from the Federal Government, but yet the burden of those people trying to send their children to school, trying to put food on the table, trying to do the things that you and I and every other American wants to do is being stymied by an oversized government, by overtaxes and regulation.

That is what this bill does, Mr. Speaker. It gives tax relief back to the American people that are paying the taxes, not nonpaying tax.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Ms. JACKSON-LEE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. GEJDENSON 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 Florida [Mr. GOSS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. GOSS 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 Michigan [Mr. LEVIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. LEVIN 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 Washington [Mrs. LINDA SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. QUINN 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 gen-

tleman from Maryland [Mr. WYNN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. WYNN 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 Wisconsin [Mr. NEUMANN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

TAX RELIEF FOR THOSE WHO NEED IT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, a comprehensive tax bill says a lot about what the priorities of our Nation are, what the values of our Nation are, in the same way that achieving a balanced budget agreement talks about who we are. The devil, if you will, is in the details, in that one has to take a look at how these concepts translate into actuality, and they determine in large measure of what our priorities and what our values are. They do not exist just by themselves.

When you look into it, whether it is a balanced budget agreement or when you look into the tax cut package, you get a sense of what the priorities and values of this country are, and we have to be clear about what those values are as a Congress and as a nation.

American middle-class families, people who are working hard, playing by the rules, are looking at the various tax proposals that are on the table at the moment and they are in fact wondering "Who is on my side?"

The tax proposal that has been made by the Republican majority says to the American public that they are on the side of the wealthiest Americans. Under the Republican bill, over half of the tax benefits go to 5 percent of Americans, those who are making over \$247,000 a year. An additional quarter of the tax cuts go to families making between \$75,000 and \$250,000 a year. That means that the rest of the American people have to share what is left over. Under the Republican plan, the 80 percent of Americans at the lowest end of the income scale receive less than 20 percent of the tax benefits. This is simply wrong.

Democrats have proposed an alternative tax package whose benefits are targeted directly to working middle-class families. The message from the Democratic side of the aisle is that we are on their side, the message to working families today. These are just not my words. I might add that there have been a number of newspaper accounts in the last several days that comment on the Republican tax proposal.

The Philadelphia Inquirer says, and this is Thursday, June 12: "Bill Archer's Gift Horse: The Congressman's

tax cut plan looks good now, but in the long term only the rich will benefit. Average Americans would be the biggest winners, says U.S. Representative BILL ARCHER. Under his new tax cut plan, he has got a tax breakout there that shows three-quarters of tax relief going to households that earn less than \$75,000 a year. Quote, sounds nice, but it is bogus. What he unveiled this week ought to be called the Tax Relief of the Money Class Act," end quote.

The New York Times, June 11, 1997, describes the tax cut plan proposed by the Republican majority as a favor-the-rich tax plan. It says that the tax writing committee has come up with a proposal that barely eases the strain on middle-class families while showering the rich with benefits. To finance cuts in capital gains and inheritance taxes, Mr. ARCHER has held tax benefits for others at a minimum level.

The Washington Post, June 11: "A bad tax bill gets worse," with the same kind of commentary.

The point is that we do have an opportunity with wanting to provide tax relief for working middle-class families today, and it would appear that the tax cut proposal by the Republican majority is not one that in fact meets the needs of working middle-class families, and in fact that the Democratic alternative looks at education tax cuts, looks at child care tax cuts, looks at a child care dependent tax credit that helps working families today, that focuses a capital gains tax cuts at small businesses, small farmers as well as the estate tax or inheritance tax, or, as my colleagues want to say, the death tax, which provides specifically targeted tax cuts at small farmers, small businesses, and provides the opportunity for those, in fact, who are working and, as I said, playing by the rules, to have the opportunity to get some tax relief.

It would be wonderful if we could provide everyone with tax relief. The 5 percent of the wealthiest Americans in this country at this time do not need to have the opportunity for that relief in the same way that working families do today.

ELIMINATING BURIAL RIGHTS FOR DEATH PENALTY CONVICTS

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce legislation that strikes at the very heart of our Nation. It saddens me to rise and offer this today, but it is the right thing to do for the veterans of our country who have given too much for us.

The most heinous domestic terrorist act ever committed ripped apart the insides of our Nation. I am referring to the Oklahoma City bombing, which will always be ingrained in our hearts, our minds, and our souls. Yet, after speaking with veterans and military

leaders, we have found out that the criminal who committed this dastardly act which killed 168 people, many of whom were innocent children, can receive, I repeat can receive, the military honor of burial, the military honor of burial in a veterans' cemetery after he receives the death penalty sentence.

Mr. Speaker, I and several of my colleagues have introduced legislation to make sure McVeigh, and other death penalty convicts like him, cannot receive the honors that our fallen heroes have deserved and have been granted. Our Nation's veterans cemeteries are a sacred ground. They are a solemn and sad reminder of the price our Nation has had to pay for the freedom that we enjoy every day. While veterans who commit certain criminal offenses forfeit their benefits, McVeigh could have still received them and received burial at Arlington National Cemetery.

Mr. Speaker, we could not allow that to happen. Too many people whose lives were taken in the name of freedom made the ultimate sacrifice for us. They are placed in that sacred ground. It is not fitting to allow the likes of Timothy McVeigh in their company.

I ask my colleagues to join my effort and cosponsor my bill, and all Members on both sides of the aisle, to eliminate these burial rights for death penalty convicts.

H.R. 100, THE GUAM COMMONWEALTH ACT

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today is June 19, 1997 here in the U.S. mainland, but on Guam it is June 20. June 20 is the 99th anniversary of the arrival of the first Americans on Guam in the capacity of bringing U.S. Government to the Island of Guam. On June 20, 1898, Captain Glass led three ships into Apra Harbor in Guam and he proceeded to fire some shots, as part of the Spanish-American War. He fired some shots at an abandoned fort. He did not know that the fort had long since been abandoned.

The Spanish authorities, not really even knowing that there was a Spanish-American War, sent out a small delegation of boats to ironically apologize for not being able to return what they assumed was a naval salute, announcing the arrival of the American ships.

Now, since the arrival of Captain Glass and subsequently, the next day on June 21, 1898, the party landed actually on Guam, raised the American standard and secured a surrender from Captain Marina and the Spanish troops and some Chamorros, native Chamorros who were also part of a Spanish militia, the militia was disbanded and Captain Glass sailed away with the understanding that Guam was now part of the emerging American empire. This became formally a part of

the instrument of the Treaty of Paris, which ended the Spanish-American War.

In the intervening 99 years, the political status of Guam remains a matter of some interest here in Washington DC, but of vital concern to the people I represent. These 99 years has been a time period where we have endured a Japanese occupation during World War II, where we endured a government by naval officials and under the Department of the Navy; we also endured civilian governors that were selected by the President and only as late as 1970 were the people of Guam granted the authority to elect their own governor.

But in this intervening 99 years we have not had a process to resolve our political status. We have had 99 years with no process for the final act of self-determination for the people of Guam, and we have had 99 years of a lack of resolution about what Guam's future is within the context of the American family, or perhaps even beyond the American family.

It is for this reason that I have introduced H.R. 100 in this Congress, and of course H.R. 100 is numbered in honor of the 100th anniversary of the taking of Guam by U.S. authorities, which will be commemorated and celebrated next year in 1998.

My bill, my commonwealth bill, represents the thinking of the people of Guam about not only the new level of political autonomy they wish to reach within the American family, but also a process, outlines a clear and defined process for how Guam's final political self-determination would be carried out and would be finally consummated.

Guam deserves this, not only because they have been loyal U.S. citizens, but because it is in the American national interests to do so. Guam not only continues to remain a vital strategic part of America's forward presence in Asia, Guam also, the challenges that are presented by territories to the American family is to perfect American democracy in those areas that are not really represented by the Stars and Stripes.

So I ask all of my colleagues and Members of this body to cosponsor H.R. 100. We have the promise of a hearing on this measure by the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG], chairman of the Committee on Resources, and that hearing will hopefully occur sometime next month.

So I ask my colleagues to consider cosponsoring H.R. 100, the Guam Commonwealth Act.

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

[Mr. DAVIS of Illinois 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 Nevada [Mr. ENSIGN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ENSIGN 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 New Jersey [Mr. ROTHMAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. ROTHMAN 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 North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. TIAHRT 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 California [Mr. RIGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. RIGGS 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 Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MIDDLE-CLASS TAX RELIEF

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are in a very important debate right now over taxes. The Republican Party is working for middle-class tax relief, and the liberal Members of the Democrat Party and the President are working against middle-class tax relief. I think it is ironic that a President who ran in 1992 on a platform of supporting middle-class tax relief is now fighting middle-class tax relief.

As my colleagues know, once the President was elected, his first act in 1993 was to pass the largest tax increase in the history of this country. Now, we are at another debate. For the first time in 16 years, because of a Republican majority in the House and Senate, we have an opportunity to give significant tax relief, and yet we are being accused of all kinds of things and we are having to fight for this.

It is interesting, because 76 percent of the people who will benefit from the

tax relief have a household income of \$75,000 or less. Only 1 percent of those who are going to have a tax benefit have a household income of over \$200,000, yet we are being accused of giving a tax break for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know what it is with the liberal psyche that being wealthy is synonymous with being evil. It is interesting, because entrepreneurs and people who tend to be wealthy create jobs in this country, and yet liberals seem to hate the job-creator.

I strongly believe that we need tax relief for the middle-class, and will the entrepreneurs also benefit from it? Yes, they will. Is it bad? Well, I always take the case of Ted Turner. I am from Georgia. Ted Turner has brought CNN to Atlanta. He has created hundreds and hundreds of jobs. Is it bad? No; it is not. Will Ted Turner get some tax relief? Yes; he will. Is that horrible? What is so bad about that, I ask my liberal colleagues? Yet, we do not hear from them about that. All we hear is well, we just do not want the rich to get tax breaks. As I said, Mr. Speaker, 76 percent of the tax relief goes to families with a household income of under \$75,000.

Now, what is it that the liberals and the President are backing away from? We seem to be in a gridlock right now on the \$500-per-child tax credit, and the way the Republican bill is, is that middle-class families with children under 17 years of age and with household incomes of under \$110,000 will get a \$500-per-child tax credit. Now, what does the President want to do? Well, he wants to use that tax credit to give another welfare benefit to people who are not paying taxes. So what has happened with a President who has promised middle-class tax relief, and also, incidentally, promised welfare reform, and only reluctantly passed welfare reform last year, now is trying to go back on that?

Welfare enrollment has decreased 15 percent. There are less people dependent on the U.S. Government now than there were 1 year ago, and yet the President wants to fly in the face of all of that, break the spirit of that bipartisan legislation, if you will, by giving people who are not working a \$500-per-child tax credit on top of something that we are already doing called the earned income tax credit, which is a benefit from going from welfare to work, and it is something that has had bipartisan support, and yet the President wants to say, no, that is not good enough, we are going to give you one more giveaway program. We are going to give you \$500-per-child for every child you have while you are not paying taxes.

Common sense would tell us, Mr. Speaker, that is a ridiculous thing to do, particularly when we have at stake 11 million middle-class children whose parents desperately need tax relief for education needs, for medical needs, for shelter, for food, and so forth like that.

I am a father of four small children. Most of my friends, Mr. Speaker, are in

the sandwich generation, if you will. That is, their parents are dependent on them or close to being dependent on them, and their children are dependent on them. I can say as I line up in the carpool line and as I go out to the Tee-ball field and I go out to the soccer field, and my wife is a proud soccer mom, I will say that the parents out there desperately need tax relief.

Now, they are not coming out here in Washington and protesting, they are not writing letters, they are not sending us faxes every minute, and the reason why, Mr. Speaker, is because they are out working. These are folks who work 8, 9, 10 hours a day, 5 days a week. They want tax relief, but they do not have paid professional lobbyists who can go out and campaign for it. We just have to do it on our own and we have to do the right thing.

This is the good old American middle-class who is getting squeezed year after year, they need tax relief, they do not need the President expanding welfare, they do not need the fun and games of politics, they do not need more big liberal programs. They need tax relief, and I urge my colleagues to support in a bipartisan fashion the Republican tax bill passed by the Committee on Ways and Means.

NO FUNDING FOR B-2 BOMBER

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address myself to a serious issue that is coming before the Congress tomorrow, and that is our defense appropriation budget. There is an item in there that I will seek to eliminate by virtue of an amendment by the gentleman from California [Mr. DELLUMS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH] and myself, which would be to strike the funding for the B-2 bomber.

In this time of budgetary constraints, Congress must learn to prioritize our defense dollars. As such, Congress should not authorize the additional procurement of aircraft we do not need and the Pentagon clearly has stated they do not want.

In testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security on June 11, 1997, Pentagon comptroller, John Hamre, testified that while the B-2 is an exceptional aircraft, there is no more money for it. The massive deep attack weapons mix study conducted by the Pentagon concluded that it would not be cost-effective to buy more B-2 bombers. According to the Pentagon, the current fleet of 21 B-2 bombers is sufficient to meet the two-war scenarios. No money is programmed in any budget plan to pay for the outyear costs that will be forced by this decision. Other programs given higher priority by the military may have to be cut back.

Finally, the Congressional Budget Office projects that to build and operate

nine additional B-2 bombers over the next 20 years could cost over \$27 billion.

□ 1345

Let me read a variety of editorials that have appeared in the papers around America.

Stuart News, Port St. Lucie, FL, "U.S. Must Get Maximum Bang for Military Bucks."

The cost of these programs is staggering, especially considering the strategic fact that the threats that they are designed to counter do not now exist or, like the B-2 bomber, are designed to attack countries that no longer exist.

They are urging we look at first providing for military pay, for military housing, for the readiness of troops, rather than expensive technological equipment that the Air Force and the Pentagon themselves do not support.

The Atlanta Constitution: "Pentagon is Not a Welfare Agency."

There is, however, one notable exception to that trend. Last week, the House Appropriations Committee approved a defense budget for 1997 of \$245.8 billion, \$11 billion more than the Pentagon says it needs, and the Pentagon is not known for underestimating its needs.

Unfortunately, each additional dollar that we spend on defense is a dollar not available for schools,

for infrastructure, or for deficit reduction.

While other nations invest their wealth in those areas, we build B-2 bombers.

"Don't Sacrifice Military Readiness," by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch.

Another case is the \$2.2 billion for each B-2 bomber, which, again, the Pentagon doesn't want, but which Members of Congress do, to keep weapons contractors and jobs alive in their district. President Clinton himself insists on yet another *Seawolf* submarine to keep the production lines open to build other submarines in the future. Meanwhile, maintenance on helicopters, tanks, trucks, and warships is being deferred. Military pay raises are paltry, and the quality of housing for men and women in uniform isn't as good as it should be.

No; because we are spending billions on a B-2 bomber that the Pentagon does not want.

Milwaukee Journal Sentinel: "Bring Military Budgets Back to Earth."

In fact, Congress in recent years has actually padded the military budget

for projects like the B-2 bomber,

that are relics from the cold war and pork-barrel goodies for hometown military contractors.

The evidence against the B-2 is overwhelming. The debate really needs to be about helping people in uniform have decent pay so they are not on food stamps, living in decent housing, like most Americans would like them to live in.

So we have a choice this week, to support the continued expenditure of massive dollars to weapons systems that we no longer need, or we can clearly change direction and focus on priorities that would make this Nation militarily sound and safe.

I urge my colleagues tomorrow to support the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. DEL-LUMS], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KASICH], and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FOLEY] to strike the B-2 bomber from funding, to close the production line, to allow the military to continue to have its 20-some B-2 bombers, but clearly understand since the end of communism and Soviet dominance in the cold war, the need for the B-2 bomber has been significantly reduced. Significantly reduced.

Let us look forward to helping make the military strong by supporting their good intentions, and not give them things they have chosen not to ask for.

THE DEMOCRATIC TAX CUT PROPOSAL RESTORES FAIRNESS TO THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana [Ms. CARSON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. CARSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about justice and fairness. When we were children our parents instilled in us a sense of fairness. We were taught to be equitable and impartial and truthful when dealing with others. We were taught to aid those in need. Obviously, all of us in this body took that to heart, and that is why we are here as we pursue public service on behalf of the public.

Let us consider the budget amendment in general, however. Rather than stay within the parameters of the balanced budget agreement which passed the House overwhelmingly, the Republican framers of the tax cut have decided not to play fair, and to abandon the agreement. The original agreement contained a provision to provide at least \$35 billion in tax credits for college education. Yet, the Republicans have offered us only \$22 billion in education tax credits, in direct violation of the budget agreement.

It seems as though this sense of fairness has been lost on those framing the tax cuts, because they are attempting to undercut the agreement that was made with the President, and will deny American taxpayers \$13 billion in tax relief. We should at least play fair and restore this provision of the tax cut.

According to the Department of the Treasury, two-thirds of the Republican tax cuts go to families making beyond \$100,000 a year. The majority of constituents in my district, Indianapolis, IN, of which nearly 50 percent make less than \$25,000 a year, they certainly will be not happy, they will be unhappy to learn the fact that the Republican tax cut will go to families making over \$100,000 a year, for the most part.

I rise to support the Democratic alternative to the Republican tax cut package. Unlike the Republican proposal, the Democratic proposal restores some fairness to the American taxpayer and stays within the parameters of the budget agreement.

In general, the Democratic tax proposal will target its cuts to those making less than \$100,000 a year, not the other way around. Seventy-one percent of the Democratic tax cuts will go to nearly 91 million families across the United States that make under \$100,000 a year. Twenty-three percent of the Democratic tax cuts will target the most vulnerable of our society, those making under \$21,000 a year.

The Democratic alternative will truly allow families to stretch their budget further and provide true tax relief, rather than just smoke and mirrors. I am particularly pleased with the education tax cut initiatives in the Democratic proposal. If we are going to truly effect positive change in our society, provide our young people the chance to improve our Nation's future, we must provide them with the opportunity to access the best education possible.

The Democratic alternative provides more money for the HOPE scholarship, provides incentives for employer-provided educational assistance, and provides a source of cost-free capital for desperately needed school construction; at least \$37 billion worth of tax cuts for education. It provides \$15 billion more education initiative than the Republican plan does.

Under the Democratic proposal, HOPE scholarship tax credits are provided at a rate of 1,100 for 1997 through 1999, increasing to \$1,500 per student after the year 2000.

At Indiana University at Indianapolis, tuition costs \$2,400 a year. At Ivy Tech State College, it runs \$1,500 a year. The Democratic HOPE tax credit will provide for nearly 50 percent of the tuition at those two referenced universities.

I would encourage, Mr. Speaker, this august body to consider what is fair and adopt the Democratic alternative, so we will truly be providing both HOPE and fairness for our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about fairness. When we were children, our parents instilled in us a sense of fairness. We were taught to be equitable, impartial, and truthful when dealing with others. We were taught to aid those in need. Obviously, all of us in this body took this message to heart. Otherwise, we would not have chosen a life of public service. Yet I am sad to say that in examining the recent Republican tax cut initiative, some of my colleagues have abandoned these principles.

First, consider the budget agreement in general. Rather than stay within the parameters of the balanced budget agreement which passed in the House overwhelmingly, the framers of the Republican tax cut have decided not to play fair and to abandon the agreement. The original agreement contained a provision to provide at least \$35 billion in tax credits for college education. Yet the Republicans have offered us only \$22 billion in education tax credits, in direct violation of the Budget Agreement. It seems as though this sense of fairness has been lost on those framing the tax cuts, because they are attempting to undercut

the agreement struck with the President, and deny American taxpayers \$13 billion in tax relief. We should at least play fair and restore this provision into the tax cut package.

Yet the skewed sense of fairness on the Republican side does not end there. The tax cut package as a whole will benefit a small percentage of middle class Americans. Let's go to the numbers. According to the Department of Treasury, two-thirds of the Republican tax cuts will go to families making over \$100,000 a year. The majority of constituents in my district in Indianapolis, of which nearly 50 percent make less than \$25,000 a year, will not be happy to learn this fact. The Republicans have promised in this Congress and the last that middle-class tax relief was their top priority, to allow those who work hard to take home more of their pay. Instead, middle-class taxpayers get the same old tried and true Republican tax cuts that benefit the wealthy, a Robin Hood in reverse for the majority of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the Democratic alternative to the Republican tax cut package. Unlike the Republican proposal, the Democratic proposal restores fairness to the American taxpayer and stays within the parameters of the budget agreement. In general, the Democratic tax proposal will target its cuts to those making less than \$100,000 a year, and not the other way around. Seventy-one percent of the Democratic tax cuts will go to the nearly 91 million families across the U.S. that make under \$100,000 a year. Twenty-three percent of the Democrat tax cuts will target the most vulnerable of our society, those making under \$21,000 a year. The Democratic alternative will truly allow families to stretch their budget further and provide true tax relief, rather than smoke and mirrors.

I am particularly pleased with the education tax cut initiatives in the Democratic proposal. If we are truly going to effect positive change in our society and provide our young people the chance to improve our Nation's future, we must provide them with the opportunity to access the best education possible. The Democratic alternative provides more money for the HOPE scholarship, provides incentives for employer-provided education assistance, and provides a source of cost-free capital for desperately needed school construction. At \$37 billion worth of tax cuts for education, it provides \$15 billion more education initiatives than the Republican plan does.

Under the Democratic proposal, HOPE scholarship tax credits are provided at a rate of \$1,100 for 1997-99, increasing to \$1,500 per student after 2001. The Republican is half this amount at \$600 per student. In addition, families could receive the credit for 4 years of postsecondary education, rather than only 2 years as provided in the Republican proposal. In my State of Indiana, \$600 does not seem like much in accessing postsecondary education. But if we provide double that amount, it will go a long way in reducing the average cost of education in my district in Indianapolis. At Indiana University-Purdue University of Indianapolis, tuition costs \$2,400 a year; at Ivy Tech State College, tuition runs at \$1,500 a year. The Democratic HOPE tax credit would provide for nearly 50 percent of the tuition at IUPUI, and nearly all of the cost at Ivy Tech. These are the two largest colleges in my district, with over 23,000 students attending the two institutions. By providing the HOPE schol-

arship at the levels provided for in the Democratic alternative, we will truly be providing HOPE for many of my constituents.

Yet another education related initiative in the Democratic proposal that I applaud is the school construction assistance provision. Schools in my district are dilapidated and crumbling. Indianapolis Public Schools recently approved drastic cuts in programs to rein in spending in their budget. With the Democratic proposal, schools in either empowerment zones or enterprise communities could enter into a partnership with private businesses that would make contributions to school improvements and would issue special bonds to finance school improvements. This would go a long way in communities such as Indianapolis to ensure that our children are not learning in deathtraps, and that we could bring our schools into the 21st century in terms of facilities by the next millennium.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton addressed this body 4 months ago in his State of the Union address. In it, he laid out an ambitious agenda for education which I, along with the majority of Americans, applauded. The President's vision for our young people and ensuring they receive the best education in the world should not be lost in the budget wrangling that occurs in this House. I urge my colleagues to adopt the Democratic alternative to the tax bill and give our working families, especially our children, the break they deserve.

THE EDUCATION AT A CROSSROADS PROJECT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mrs. NORTHUP] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the House's attention the visit last month of the Education at a Crossroads Project. I have had, as the mother of six children, a great interest in education and in the education of each of my children. For that reason, in the 9 years that I was in the Kentucky General Assembly I was very involved in the education program, in working to implement the new Education Reform Act that was implemented by Kentucky in 1990. That act is often pointed to by departments of education around the country as an example of education and education progress.

The implementation of that bill has been very challenging in our State. It is not universally acclaimed and it has not had universal success, but it has made a dramatic difference in the education opportunities for many children. I would like to talk today about some of the basis of that program that I think is accepted and is believed has made the most difference.

The program is based on the fact that each child, each community, each faculty in a school face unique challenges to succeed and have unique talents to address those challenges. It was not believed that at the State level, and certainly, Mr. Speaker, not at the Federal level could we fashion an educational system that would meet all the differing needs of each neighborhood, each community across our State.

So we put in place a program where each State, based on the parental involvement, the teacher involvement, have site-based decisionmaking. They have the ultimate responsibility for each child achieving at a higher level. Yes, we expect each child can learn at a higher level, can achieve high academic success if our expectations are high.

In each of our schools, Mr. Speaker, we have site-based decisionmaking that assesses what the challenges are: what are the programs that are needed, what are the extended day programs, what are the after-school programs, the Saturday learning opportunities, the year-round schools; the challenges that are most needed so each child has the best opportunities for success?

Each school is given the resources so they can determine themselves how to use those resources to meet those needs. As the Federal Government ponders how we make an impact in school, I think looking at Kentucky, as this administration so often does, is a good point of reference.

Rather than fashioning programs that are going to be the same across the country, we need to designate our schools as the front line of education opportunity and make sure that they are not bound by more regulations, by more constraining programs, by programs that tie their hands, tie the teachers' hands, and tie their abilities to uniquely address the challenges that exist in that school.

I have been proud to work with education in Kentucky, and I was thrilled that the Education at a Crossroads came to Kentucky, because it gave them an opportunity to see the Cane Run Elementary School that is in one of the most high-risk neighborhoods of Jefferson County, and the success they have achieved; the children whose grades and their achievement scores have gone up so dramatically, the parents who come to school every morning to that school so they, too, can get their GED and go on to better welfare-to-work opportunities.

The Cane Run Elementary School has dramatically changed the opportunities not only of children who are in that school, but also of the mothers and fathers who are in that district, so their opportunities are better and improved too. There is such a sense of accomplishment, such a sense of achievement, such a sense of joy in that school for the achievement that has been realized.

I think it points to the example of where, on the front lines, the school that is empowered to make the decision to use the money in block grant form to address its needs, the success it can achieve.

They also visited Southern High School, that has a model program, school-to-work. It is helped by the private sector. They have invested a million dollars of equipment and energy to make sure that those students have the high-tech opportunities to learn, so

they can move into the work force in high-paying jobs.

Every student in that senior high whose goal it was to have a good job came out well-trained with more job opportunities than there were students to fill that. These are not kids that are starting at minimum wage, but far above that. Their opportunities and their benefits are proof of the success that program has.

I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity to talk to the House today about what works and what does not.

□ 1400

NATIONAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thought I would start out my discussion today, I want to talk a little bit about national security, but I thought I would start out the discussion today, since MFN, that is most-favored-nation treatment for China, trade treatment for China, is at issue and we will be discussing and debating this issue on the House floor, there is a lot of commentary on it right now, I thought I would start out today with a statement that was made, apparently by the NFIB or one of our other good groups that wants to continue this trade relationship with China, and presumably this \$40 billion annual trade deficit that we suffer at the hands of China, one of their statements was, gee, if we cut off China, we are not going to get any Tickle Me Elmos because apparently Tickle Me Elmo is made in, of course, Red China. It is made in China and presumably some of the slave labor that makes some of the textiles in China also makes Tickle Me Elmos.

I thought that in light of what the Chinese are doing with the \$40 billion trade surplus that they enjoy over the United States, that means they get \$40 billion in hard American dollars for things they sell us in excess of what we sell them, when we do all of our trading at the end of the year, they have got 40 extra billion dollars in their bank accounts that we do not have in our bank account because they enjoy a trade surplus over us. That is largely because the Chinese have a massive tariff for almost every American item.

Of course, they enjoy virtually free access to the American market. But they make Tickle Me Elmo. It is made in China. One of our good trade groups said, gee, we will not have any more Tickle Me Elmos and should we not be upset about that because we want our children to have a nice life and having a Tickle Me Elmo presumably is a real illustration of quality of life now.

But here is the reason why we should not care whether or not we get a lot of Tickle Me Elmos or other toys from

Communist China. They are taking that \$40 billion and they are going to their friends, the Soviet Union, former Soviet Union, now the main player is Russia, and they are buying military hardware. They are buying a lot of this hardware and aiming it at guess who, the people that provided the dollars in the first place, the good old Americans. They are using this 40 billion extra dollars a year to arm.

That means they are not only building these, this is a missile destroyer that they just purchased from Russia, it has one purpose and that is to kill American carriers. That means killing the 5,000 uniformed sailors who are on board an American carrier as well as the attending ships in the battle fleet formation. This was designed by the Russians with their surface-to-surface missiles, their N-22, their SSM, their 44 SAN-17's and their SAM's and their four point defense systems and their 130 millimeter guns and their helicopter. That has one job in mind and one purpose, and that is to destroy American surface ships.

The Chinese are able to buy these now from the Russians with hard dollars. They did not used to pay hard dollars. They would give IOUs and they did not get very much of that, because they were a dollar short. They were cash strapped. We have now given them all kinds of money from these doggone Tickle Me Elmo sales and dozens of other commodities that we now purchase from them. And they are buying weapons and they are aiming them, their nuclear weapons, nuclear missiles are aimed at the guys, the American people who gave them the money in the first place. They are aimed at American cities.

So as we enter into this debate over whether or not we should continue to have these Tickle Me Elmo transfers with China, I would suggest that they are in reality a Torture Me Elmo transaction, because in the end the same young Americans, the people that we are trying to give a good lifestyle to now, our children, may face American technology. And in the least they are going to face military technology that was purchased with American dollars from their own parents on the battlefield, coming back our way, the bullets will be coming back at us. So when we put together this China policy, I think we have to look at a couple of things.

One thing is, by maintaining this beneficial trade relationship with China, when I say that I mean beneficial especially for China, we are making China economically strong. China is becoming very economically powerful. As they become economically powerful, it is our hope, of course, that they will have a benign leadership, a leadership which appreciates human rights, appreciates the rights of other nations on the earth to exist and will not have, not focus in the future on military exploitation and on an aggressive national security stance. We hope that but we do not know.

So the point is, we are making China strong economically and militarily with our dollars and we do not know where China is going. Incidentally, that carries me to a second subpoint.

We passed an amendment in the Committee on National Security. I wish the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. TAYLOR] was here from Mississippi who was very instrumental in that debate, along with the gentleman from California [Mr. BONO] and a number of other members of the Committee on National Security and the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. ABERCROMBIE], and we passed an amendment that prevents an arm of the Chinese Government, it is called COSCO, COSCO is not where you go to buy your lawn chairs, COSCO is the Chinese Ocean Shipping Corporation. And they have done a pretty smart thing. They have corporatized different arms of their government on the basis that good old Americans, Republicans and Democrats, are a little bit wary of the Communist army and other agencies that are centralized agencies in part of the Beijing Government, but if you call something a corporation, that makes us feel very comfortable because we are a bunch of capitalists and we like corporations.

So they have corporatized a maritime arm of their government. And that maritime arm is buying the U.S. Naval Base at Long Beach or leasing the U.S. Naval Base at Long Beach. Of course, the port reuse facility or entity, that is the Reuse Commission at Long Beach, when the Long Beach Naval Station got closed, were looking around for a beneficial use. When we put that law into place that allowed for some closing of military bases, we envisioned that there would be industrial parks and other types of development that would take the place of military activities on these bases. We never envisioned in our wildest dreams that a foreign nation, especially one that has nuclear weapons aimed at our cities, would want to lease one of our U.S. naval bases. But that is what they are doing with the 135 acre terminal at Long Beach. I think that is bad for a number of reasons.

I am glad to see my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development of the Committee on National Security, joining me.

There are a number of problems with allowing a foreign government to have such a large facility at a fairly strategic location like that. First, you can do a lot more with a 135-acre facility in terms of intelligence gathering than you can if you are just trying to intercept signals coming off a ship with your own ship. You have a permanent location. You are able to have bigger physical facilities to intercept intelligence.

Also presumably you have a pretty large staff of people. We know as a matter of record that the Chinese Government attends its industrial facilities around the world with intelligence

agents. So unless they change course and do something that they have not done before, they will have intelligence agents at this base at Long Beach, and presumably they are going to use them to gather intelligence on U.S. military activity and presumably also on the high tech industry in California.

Anyway, it is clear that China is on the rise, on the ascension in terms of its military buildup, its military apparatus, and it would be very wise for us, I think, to do two things. First, to be very wary about funding the buildup. Why pay for their arms buildup by buying a bunch of doggone Tickle Me Elmos and other things that we purchase from them? And second, let us make sure that our own national security is not on the descent. I want to tell you where we are at with respect to our security because most Americans do not know this.

When we won Desert Storm, here is what we had. We had 18 Army divisions. We had 24 active fighter airwings, that was our air power. We had 546 Navy ships. Since Desert Storm, since we saw those great pictures on television of us taking care of Saddam Hussein in short order, we have gone to this buildup or this force structure because we have actually built down. We have gone from 18 Army divisions in 1991 to 10. We have cut the Army almost in half. We have gone from 24 fighter airwings to 13. So we have cut our air power almost in half. And we have gone from 546 Navy ships to 346 so we have cut the Navy by about 40 percent in terms of structure.

Interestingly, we are down to the level that is just about where we were when on June 25, 1950, the North Koreans invaded South Korea. We had 10 Army divisions in those days. Within 3 days, the North Koreans had taken all of Seoul; that was the capital of South Korea. They were driving southward on the Korean peninsula. The peninsula looks a little bit like Florida. They almost pushed the Americans entirely off the peninsula. Pusan is a little port at the southern tip of South Korea. We were right at the southern tip there. And we formed the perimeter. We flew part of the 25th Infantry Division from Tokyo to try to stop them. They got torn to pieces. We flew in the rest of the division. The division commander got captured. We lost 50,000 people killed in Korea. That is just about as many as the Vietnam War. But we did that because we drew down our military strength so sharply after World War II that we were so weak that a third rate military power pushed us down in the Korean peninsula just a few years later.

So we need to rebuild national security. And we are going to be having the defense bill on the floor here in just a matter of hours. I think tomorrow it will be coming up on the floor. And I want to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] who has done a tremendous job heading the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development.

Let me say, before yielding to him, that our chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has done a great job of taking a few scarce extra dollars that the Republican side of the aisle has put into the budget for defense, not enough of an increase in force structure to what I think it should be, but they have given a few extra dollars. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. SPENCE] has allocated that money with only one direction to us. Try to make our national security apparatus stronger, try to get the equipment that the men and women in uniform need and try to see to it that we have the best in terms of quality of life for those men and women.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I cannot stay with him for the entire hour, but I appreciate his leadership, not just for this special order but for the leadership he provides on the committee and as chairman of our acquisition and procurement operations. He has done a fantastic job. I appreciate that. I know that the country does as well.

I want to follow up on his point about the perception of the American people that somehow we have dramatically increased defense spending over the past several years. Unfortunately, I think part of that perception has been created by the White House itself.

Let us go back. The gentleman talked about some of the things that have taken place in terms of cutbacks. Let me highlight a few other facts that our colleagues need to keep in mind tomorrow as we begin the defense bill.

During John Kennedy's era, that was at a time of relative peace, it was after Korea and before Vietnam, we were spending 9 percent of our gross national product as a Nation on the military. We were spending over 50 cents of every Federal tax dollar coming into Washington on the military, nine percent of our GNP over 50 cents of every tax dollar.

In this year's budget, we are spending less than 3 percent of our GNP on defense; 16 cents out of the Federal tax dollar will go toward the military in this next fiscal year, 16 cents and dropping. That does not take into consideration the fact that when John Kennedy was President, we drafted young kids out of high school. They were paid less than the minimum wage. They served the country for peanuts. They were not married. They did not have families.

Today we have an all-volunteer force. Our kids are better educated. Many of them are married. They have spouses. We have housing costs, health care costs, education costs. We pay them a decent wage. So out of that 16 cents that we are spending, a much higher percentage of that goes for quality of life. It does not go for exotic weapons systems. It goes to protect the morale

and the well-being of the members of the military and their families and loved ones.

We take those factors and then add in that we have had an administration over the past 5 years who has increased the level of deploying our troops to the highest level in the last 50 years. This President has committed our troops to more locations and more operations than any President since World War II. So we have increased costs with deployments that we did not budget for.

In fact, as the administration has put our troops in Haiti, which was hotly debated in this Congress, the problem is not just the increased costs that we have to pay for our troops to be there, but as the gentleman full well knows, we are also paying for the cost for the housing and the food of the other countries.

The President talked about how he has a multinational effort. What he does not tell the American people is the reason why Bangladesh sent 1000 troops is we are paying their housing and food costs. It is a great deal for them.

What the President did not tell the American people in the Balkans, when he committed us to get involved in the Balkans over in Bosnia, and I would say that the majority of the Members of this body did not disagree with our being a part of the multinational force, our problem was, why were we committing 36,000 troops to that theater on the ground and in the area when Germany, right next door, was only putting 4000 troops in and when the Japanese were not paying their fair share?

□ 1415

So the point is, as the defense dollar has gone down, as quality of life costs have gone up, we have seen a President who has overseen these cuts increase dramatically where we send these kids around the world, and also increase dramatically the amount of DOD money going for environmental clean-up. So the largest pot of money being used to clean up environmental sites in America is not the energy bill, it is not the commerce bill, it is not the bill to reauthorize EPA, it is the Department of Defense bill. And, as the gentleman full well knows, we are spending hundreds of millions and billions of dollars out of DOD's budget to clean up sites and to pay lawyers, which is the bulk of what we do.

The Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Krulak, told me one month ago he was required in this fiscal year to request one-half of the amount of money he is spending on his total buying for all the Marine Corps on environmental costs. So he is spending one-half of his total buy just on environmental costs.

Mr. HUNTER. If the gentleman will allow me to reclaim for a second, that means when our Marines get back from places like Bosnia, places like Somalia, they have very little money to refurbish their equipment and get ready for the war.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Exactly.

Mr. HUNTER. Because if they do not do the environmental cleanups on places like Camp Pendleton, the commander goes to jail if he does not comply.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Right. So all of these factors have caused us to be put into an environment where we cannot meet the needs of our military. That has resulted in a decline of morale. That has resulted in problems in terms of funding.

I have been with base commanders who have not paid their electric bill for 8 months because they have had to shift money over to help the administration pay for deployments that they never budgeted for. All of this we have to deal with.

Now, for the past 2 years, the Republicans, supported by a significant number of Democrats who are our friends, this is a bipartisan debate in the Congress, the battle here is not Republicans versus Democrats. The battle here is this Congress versus a White House that is totally insensitive, in my opinion, to the military needs. We increased funding for defense for the past 2 years.

What did the administration do? They soundly and roundly criticized us. They said this money was going for what they called pork barrel programs, even though 98 percent of what we funded were requests by the services.

But what really offended me was former Secretary Perry coming in before our committee and testifying that they had stopped the cuts in the acquisition accounts. In effect, what he was doing was taking credit for the plus-ups that they had criticized us for putting in the year before.

Even more outrageous, and the gentleman knows full well this issue because he and I cochaired this hearing, we told the administration that in each of the past 3 years they were grossly underfunding our requests for national missile defense. We put extra money in and we were criticized.

What did the administration do the beginning of this year? Secretary Cohen, being an honest broker, came before the Congress and said, "Well, ladies and gentlemen, we made a mistake. We have underfunded national missile defense by \$2.3 billion."

So after the President submitted his budget, we were then given the task to go out and find the money that the President did not ask for, that we told him about for the past 3 years, to fund missile defense. So out of my subcommittee I had to eat a \$474 million plus-up just for national missile defense, to fund the shortcomings and the mismanagement of this administration.

On top of that, because they underfunded the intelligence budget, they asked me to also put up \$207 million of additional funding to fund the shortfall in intelligence.

On top of that, even though the President pounded his fist on the table

and said to the AIPAC members across the country that he was for the Nautilus program, and that he would fight to protect the Israeli people, he never requested funding for that very program. And as the gentleman full well knows, we had to go and find out ourselves by plussing up our own estimate of what the money would be needed to give the Department of Defense enough money next year to actually implement the cooperative program with Israel called tactical high energy laser. Once again, the administration committed to it but never asked for the funding to make it happen. All of these things we have attempted to deal with in this bill.

I say to my friends and my colleagues who will listen to the debate tomorrow that they should be very careful because we are in a very difficult time. We are having to make decisions in an environment where the administration is not giving us the leadership. They are causing us to spend more money than we have, they are causing us to stretch programs out, driving up the costs of those programs, and they are not working with us in a way they should be working with us for the betterment of our people and for our troops.

I would add one more point. The administration talks a good game about jobs and so do the Members on the other side. I heard some of my colleagues down here wailing about the loss of jobs in this country. And as my good friend knows, we do not fund defense because it provides jobs, we fund defense because we want to support our troops and because there has never been a country that has been attacked because it was too strong. We never want to lose that edge.

But over the past 5 years, under this President, something we have never heard the other side talk about when they have railed about NAFTA, when they have railed about this side of the aisle, is the 1 million men and women who belong to unions who have lost their jobs because of this President's cuts in defense spending. He has decimated defense in aerospace.

So the gentleman has had a million workers who belong to the UAW, the IAN, the building trades, all the major metal trades, and all of them have felt the impact of the downsizing. Most of those people are out looking for positions paying not even one-half of what they were making when they worked in the defense industry. Another important point about the impact of the defense downsizing and the impact on our industrial base that has occurred over the past 5 years.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I thank him for the dialogue that he has commenced with a lot of working people in this country to let them know how important defense is from an industrial base perspective.

I might mention that about 250,000 of those aerospace workers who lost their jobs, it is real, because 250,000 of them

lost their jobs in California as a result of the downsizing.

But I want to take the gentleman back, because first he has been our leader in missile defense, and his subcommittee, the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, is the place where we put our plans together for missile defense to defend this country and to defend our troops in theater, and we move out with those plans and try to build those systems over the years.

I want to start the gentleman at about 1986 or 1987, when the gentleman and myself put together a letter that we sent to the defense secretary or defense minister of Israel, and we told him that at some point in the near future Israel would be attacked with ballistic missiles, made in Russia, coming from a neighboring nation. In that case I think we suggested in our letter that that might be Syria. Turned out it was another nation, it was Iraq, but in fact that happened.

We urged Israel to commence a program, not of building fighter planes, because everybody builds fighter planes, to drop that Lavi fighter, but to make the centerpiece of the American-Israeli production agreement and cooperation to make that missile defense. Because nobody in the free world made missile defense, and at that time we did not do it.

Partly as a result of what we did, and I think also as a result of what our Secretary of Defense did at that time, and I think some good thinking on the part of Israel's leaders, they embarked on the ARROW program, which is one of their missile defense programs, and they have a certain sense of urgency, because they know life is real, missile attacks happen. They have moved out with some urgency and are having a pretty good program with ARROW.

I would like the gentleman, because he is the expert on missile defense, to walk us through our programs, our Navy programs and our Army programs, and let our folks know, the Members of Congress and the American people, where we stand on those programs. What is happening? And I yield to him.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman and appreciate his lead on missile defense initiatives.

This Congress, again in a bipartisan manner, Democrats and Republicans, have come together for the past 3 years, and the single biggest difference between our position on security and the President's is we have said we have to move aggressively in protecting our troops, our allies and our citizens. Two years ago we plussed up by a billion dollars in this area, last year by a billion. This year our bill calls for about \$800 million of additional spending.

Now, why do we do that? My friend and colleague knows the largest loss of life from a single incident that we have had, at least in the last 5 years, actually a little bit longer than 5 years,

was when we lost those troops that were killed by that incoming Scud missile in Saudi Arabia. It was horrible. These young kids never had a chance. What hit them? A low-class, very rudely constructed missile that Iraq fired into that barracks.

Mr. HUNTER. It was basically the Model T of missiles.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. That is right, the Model T.

We said as a Nation, never again will this happen to our troops. That is why the Congress gave the administration carte blanche. We said we would give them the money they needed, we would give them the resources, but they needed to give us a system that is highly effective, that will protect our kids wherever they are in the world.

What has been the administration's response? They now are projecting that they want to wait until 15 years after those kids were killed to deploy the first battery of that highly effective system that is now called THAAD, theater high altitude area defense system. We say that is unacceptable.

We provide the full funding for THAAD, but we go beyond that. We fund the Navy's lower tier program, because we believe, as the scientists have told us, that the best way to protect our troops and our allies and our people from the threat of missile proliferation, that the best way to do it is to have a layered approach.

The first layer is Navy lower tier, which provides protection against cruise missiles. Cruise missiles are now being built by over 20 nations. Over 75 nations in the world now have cruise missiles. Pakistan, India, Iraq, Iran, every country we can think of has cruise missiles that they can fire.

We are putting the funding in well above what the President asked for, but what the Navy requested to implement Navy lower tier as soon as possible. We have a promising capability, as my colleague and friends know, in Navy upper tier to give us a capability using the Aegis systems to allow us to protect our ships wherever they are and to provide a wider range of coverage against faster, hotter missiles.

We have funded that system to a higher level, again in line with what the Navy says they need to move aggressively, to see whether or not Navy upper tier offers us potential well beyond just protecting a fleet of ships, perhaps even becoming eventually a national missile defense system.

Now, while we have been doing that, funding Navy upper tier, Navy lower tier, THAAD, cruise missile defense, we have also funded a space-based sensing capability so that we can detect the moment that a rocket is launched so that we can activate a response.

Now, some on the liberal side would say we should not do that, that is destabilizing. The Russians have had the world's only operational ABM system in place since the ABM Treaty was signed back in 1972. It protects 80 percent of the Russian people around Mos-

cow and they have modified it three times.

The Russians, as my colleague and friends knows, have some of the most sophisticated missile defense systems they are now selling on the marketplace. In fact, the gentleman and I have had conversations that perhaps we ought to buy that system, because under this President we are never going to be able to deploy a decent, effective system.

General Lyles is on the record, and Under Secretary Kaminski, in charge of technology for DOD, said that we will not have a highly effective system under their plan to protect our troops until 2006.

Now, why is that such a priority for us? As my colleague and friend knows, we were told by the intelligence community that we would not have to worry about a threat to our troops or our homeland. They said we would see evidence of an aggressive testing program by an adversary like North Korea. We were told the No Dong missile of North Korea, with a range of 1,300 kilometers, would never threaten our troops because we would see it developing, so we could take our time.

Up until 1 month ago, when the world community saw North Korea deploy the No Dong missile system now. So that today, June 16, we have all of our troops in Japan, South Korea, and Okinawa at risk from the threat of a No Dong missile being fired at them, for which we have no defensive system that can shoot that missile down.

That is outrageous, and that is what this whole debate is about, giving us a capability that we know is there. It is kind of ironic that the administration now comes back this year and says to the Congress, "Well, we criticized you soundly last year and the year before on missile defense, but we guess you were right. We did underfund national missile defense by \$2.3 billion, and would you please help us find that money?"

But it really irritates me that it has taken us 3 years to convince the administration that they had in fact not had the facts on their side. Only because of the efforts of a bipartisan group in this Congress with the leadership of my good friend and colleague, joined by Members of the other side, have we been able to keep these missile systems in place to protect us.

While we have done that, as the gentleman knows, we are increasing funding above the administration to protect us against the chemical or biological attack. That is the Congress taking the lead, not the White House.

□ 1430

Three years ago we started funding money for chem-bio technology, for training our first responders. The administration followed us. We were the ones in the Congress that funded extra money for technology relative to information warfare above what the White House requested.

This Congress has been the guardian of the defense of this country for the past 6 years under this administration. Once again, we hope that our colleagues tomorrow will begin to understand why this has been so important and why we ask for them to join with us in a strong bipartisan vote.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON]. He has made an excellent statement. He gives us great leadership on the committee, and I look forward to seeing him tomorrow and seeing a lot of other folks who presumably will give us a lot of support also. I thank the gentleman for his leadership on national defense.

One thing that the gentleman said, I think, should be very well taken by the people who have put together national security, and that is that we should have the Boy Scout motto, "Be Prepared." Because we have a number of nations in the world that have nuclear systems right now and have missiles, and right now they may not have the political intent to do us harm, but political intent can change overnight. Political intent can change with one election, one coup, one dramatic change of direction by any of a number of countries, and we will then, right then, have to be prepared to defend ourselves.

The idea that this administration says that is not so, we do not have to start preparing until it is clear that somebody intends to do us harm, is an illustration of the fact that the folks in the administration have not read history books.

We were not prepared for Pearl Harbor. I asked a number of our intelligence agents, intelligence leaders to tell me the other day how many of them predicted the Falklands War between Britain and Argentina. None of them predicted that. Well, I went to something a little easier: How about the fall of the Russian empire, how many of them predicted that? None of them predicted the fall of the Russian empire. Lastly, I said, how many of them predicted the invasion of Kuwait? One said, before or after the tanks started rolling? I said, no, it has got to be after the tanks had started rolling. None of them predicted the invasion of Kuwait.

So we know this: We have had a lot of wars in this century; we lost a lot of Americans killed in action; we are going to have more wars. That is human nature. That is the nature of nations. It is the nature of some of the aggressors around the world that we will have wars.

The only question will be, will we be so prepared and so strong that other countries do not mess with us? We are not that strong at this point, and we need to turn it around.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON].

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on the way out, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER]

struck a note that I had to come back and respond, because he is raising very valid points here. When he talks about intelligence and how we decide how much money to spend on defense, it is supposed to be driven by the threat that we see emerging around the world.

Unfortunately, in many cases it has not been done in that manner. In fact, it has been basically a budget number given to us. But hopefully tomorrow, to my good friend and colleague, the Committee on Rules will allow me to offer one, and I have actually asked two amendments to be put in order, and the gentleman will know the importance of each of these amendments.

The reason why we have such a tough time convincing the American people on the issue, or the American people have been lulled into a sense of complacency, is that we have heard nothing from the bully pulpit except do not worry, everything is OK.

As my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] knows, this President on 135 occasions has made a speech that has the same phrase in it. He has done it 3 times at the podium in this room. He has done it on college campuses. He has done it before women's groups and national associations where he has looked this group squarely in the eye, squarely in the TV camera, and he said, "You can sleep well tonight because, for the first time in 50 years, there are no long-range missiles with nuclear weapons pointed at America's children."

Now, he has made that statement 135-some-times, and most of our constituents, since the President is the Commander in Chief, think that he probably knows what he is talking about. My amendment says one very simple thing: Mr. President, certify to the Congress the facts that bear out your statement. Certify to us that you can document that there are no long-range ICBM's pointed at our children. Certify to us how long it takes to re-target those missiles, which we have been told in hearings takes about 30 seconds, some have said 10 seconds. And certify to us that if a missile is taken off of targeting, that when that missile is activated it reverts back to the original targeting pinpoint, which would mean it would be aimed at an American city.

The President, as my good friend knows, cannot certify that. Because we have heard testimony over and over again that we do not know whether or not Russia has taken its missiles off of activation in terms of targeting our cities. We cannot verify that. But the point is that when the President says that over and over again, that drives the mood in this country that there is no longer a threat.

The second issue is one that is becoming increasingly important. As my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER], knows, I work Russian issues aggressively and advocate engaging the Russians. But there has been a project in the Ural Mountains that Russia has been working on

for 18 years. They built a city of 65,000 people right next to it. The site is called Beloretsk 15 and 16. And this site, we just do not know what it is for. They actually have mined out over 18 years a monstrous underground complex.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would hold for a second, that complex is bigger, as I understand it, than the District of Columbia.

Mr. WELDON. That is right, it is exactly bigger.

Mr. HUNTER. All underground.

Mr. WELDON. Pennsylvania. All underground. There have been articles in the London Times and the New York Times and there have been over 30 articles in the Russian media about this project.

When I was in Russia, my 10th visit to that country, 3 weeks ago, I met with Minister of Atomic Energy Mikhaylov, I met with Minister of Natural Resources Orlov, I met with Boris Yeltsin's top assistant, Boris Nemtsov, I met with the Deputy Defense Minister Mikoshin and I met with the No. 2 guy in the general staff, General Manlov, and I asked each of them about this project and I said, we need to have some transparency.

The response was, each of them knew about the project but none of them would claim that it was their project. In fact, Mr. Mikoshin said to me in front of five Members of Congress, "Mr. Chairman, Mr. Congressman, I know of that project, and I do not like that project. But to get further information, you have to go directly to Boris Yeltsin."

Now I could tell my friend and colleague, I have had all the briefings that we can get as Members, classified at the highest levels. We do not understand what is going on there. If you read the Russian media, in 1991, General Zyuganov, who was in charge of this project, said that it was an ore mining project. In 1992, General Zyuganov said that it was a facility to store food and clothing. Since that point in time, the Russian security apparatus has identified this project as one that is of strategic importance, that is one of the highest security that exists in Russia today.

My point is, at the same time that we have a President and an administration trying to create a feeling that there is no longer a concern, we ignore the fact that there are things going on in the world, not just in Russia, the transfer of technology from China, the M-11 missiles, the ring magnets, the chemical-biological technology, the Iraqis taking accelerometers and gyroscopes from Russia for long-range missiles. All of these things are happening, and not in a vacuum, and yet we have a President that is telling the American people, do not worry, there is nothing to be concerned about.

In fact, he is even going so far as to basically ignore the enforcement of the arms control agreements that he maintains should be the cornerstone of our

relationship. He has waived the sanctions under the MTCR with China. He has waived the sanctions under the MTCR with Russia time and again. So even though the administration claims arms control agreements are the critical component of our bilateral relationships, there is a pattern here of consistently waiving sanctions that should be imposed under them.

The reason why I mention all these things is because the administration is driving a feeling in this country that creates a false sense of security. As my friend knows, we are not advocating that we resort to the cold war again. In fact, we are doing more with Russia than any Congress has done in the last 50 years proactively. But we want an administration to work with us, to be candid, to be honest and forthright.

We get none of those things in this administration. In fact, we have gotten little or no cooperation on strategic programs that we feel are important, that our Joint Chiefs feel are important to our long-term security.

I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. HUNTER] for yielding on those couple of points I wanted to also add.

Mr. HUNTER. I thank my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON], so much for his words. I hope they will be well taken on the floor tomorrow.

Let me go back to what we actually have in terms of a defense apparatus that he spoke so eloquently about. As I have said, we have gone from 18 to 10 Army divisions, 24 to 13 fighter air wings, 546 Navy ships to 346, all since Desert Storm.

Now what does Congress and what does the President owe to the American people in terms of national security? According to the Constitution, the President is the Commander in Chief. The Congress is charged with raising the navies and the armies necessary to defend America. Well, what is that?

Well, over the years, we have come to the conclusion that we have to be prepared to fight two wars almost at the same time. The reason we have to be prepared for that is because if we get in a conflict in Korea or in the Middle East and we get our military tied down in that area, there is a chance that somebody else on the other side of the globe is going to look at that as an opportunity to do something, like invade South Korea, for example, or do something else along that line. So we have to be prepared to fight two wars at about the same time.

Now, we have folks in the Pentagon, great folks, great minds, civilian and military, doing war games all the time and trying to figure out what it is going to take, how many people do we need, Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Air Force, how many planes, tanks, ships do we need, what type, how much ammo do we need to fight that two-war scenario. They are supposed to put that all together and come up to us with a

bill for it and say, here is what it is going to cost, Mr. Congressman, Mr. Representative, Mr. Senator, Mr. President. Here is what it is going to cost to defend the American people, our number one obligation.

So we have said, well, it has got to be a two-war requirement. We have to have the ability to fight those two fights at the same time. Well, what are those two fights? It is interesting because two of the wars that we think are the most possible, the most probable, are wars we have already fought. We fought on the Korean peninsula starting June 25, 1950. We fought Desert Storm on the sands of Iraq after Saddam Hussein invaded Kuwait. We fought that war.

I want to tell my colleagues what it took to fight both those wars. First, in Korea we used seven Army divisions. That is seven. In Desert Storm, we used eight Army divisions. That is eight. Eight and seven is 15. The Clinton administration has cut our Army divisions from 18 to 10. So we have the prospect of fighting two wars that used a combined 15 Army divisions, and we only have two-thirds of that strength. We can go right down the list with respect to air power and with respect to U.S. Navy requirements and we are short. We are short of fighting the two-war scenario.

I looked at Louis Johnson's testimony. He was then the Secretary of Defense in 1950, just a couple months before North Korea invaded the South. And I see a lot of the same words that we see coming from this President's administration back then. Louis Johnson did not seem very alarmed. He had no idea that a bloody war would start in about 4 months. He said things like, "We are turning fat into muscle. We are getting a lot of people from behind their desks and putting them in the field. We are creative. We are innovative." He had a very pleasant and, I think, a very optimistic view that he presented to the U.S. Congress.

We asked Omar Bradley, then General of the Army, five-star General Omar Bradley, to comment on the state of the defense budget. One thing Bradley was known for, even though he went along with what his President requested, he did give us one warning that we did not heed. He said, "We cannot win a major war with the size of the military we have now." He said that he did go along with the budget because it provided a core around which we could build in times of an emergency. But Omar Bradley knew that we could not fight a major war. And, unfortunately, within a few months we were in a major war.

Now, a lot of folks back then had the same idea that the Clinton administration has today. They said, you know, we are never going to have to fight the Chinese or the Koreans or anybody else because we have, guess what, the atom bomb, and nobody wants to mess with a country that has the atom bomb.

But nonetheless, after the North Koreans pushed us down the peninsula, we

finally got a foothold in the Pusan perimeter, we pushed them back up, we started to win. The Chinese sent in hundreds of thousands of troops, surprising us by getting involved in this war we never thought they would get involved in.

□ 1445

The Secretary of Defense who is a fine gentleman, Secretary Cohen, a man I really like and respect, had somewhat of the same description about Desert Storm. I pointed out that we did not have as many Army divisions as we had then and we used up almost all of them, 8 of them, in Desert Storm. We only have 10 today. And he talked about Saddam Hussein being weaker now than he was in the old days. But remember, we were worried that other nations in that area would come to Saddam Hussein's assistance, would help him, and he was out shopping around trying to get his neighbors to support him against the United States. But every time he got to one of those countries, George Bush had been there in front of him and had lined that country up solidly on our side, countries like Egypt, that Saddam Hussein thought he might be able to bring over. So Saddam Hussein had to fight Desert Storm alone. That might not happen in the future. We cannot make all of our war plans based on Saddam Hussein acting alone the next time. We have to be prepared for him to act with some allies.

Similarly when the Chinese had no problem with getting involved in Korea when we had nuclear weapons and they did not, today they have nuclear weapons aimed at American cities, and they have that leverage and we have nuclear weapons also. They are much stronger in a relative sense than they were in 1950. They had no problem with sending their hordes of people south to kill Americans on the Korean Peninsula in 1951. They will not have any qualms about doing that today. So we are weak.

We have undertaken this drawdown that is a historic cycle in America. After we got involved in World War I, we lost a lot of people, our people came home and wanted to do other things, Americans had no taste for a large defense budget, we cut our budget dramatically. The justification for cutting it was we said, "We have already fought the war to end all wars." For folks that are studying history, that was a well-known phrase in the 1920s because World War I was so bloody and so tough and so rugged on people that we did not contemplate there would ever be another war. Well, a war to end all wars was followed by what, another war to end all wars. That was World War II which once again caught us without the industrial base that we needed and without the defense forces that we needed to deter Japan, that means keep Japan from attacking the United States. So we had a bloody war. We lost a ton of good Americans. Once

again we came home after the war, we had about 9 million people under arms in 1945, we came home after the war, we threw away our weapons. General Marshall was asked how is the demobilization going, he said, "It's not a demobilization." He said, "This is a rout. People are just throwing their weapons away." We need to stay strong but we did not stay strong and we only had 10 Army divisions when Korea started. That is the number of Army divisions we have today. We kidded ourselves about not having to have those people. In fact, in that year in 1950 just before Korea was invaded, the other body, the Senate, tried to pull the defense numbers down by \$100 million. The House of Representatives stood up to them and would not let them make that reduction. We have now won the cold war. But the ambitions of Russia can be reconstituted just as fast as they were dissipated. Russia has turned and within just a few months' time actually changed their intentions with respect to the United States from being an extremely aggressive nation, an extremely ambitious nation that was working hard in Africa, they were working hard in our own hemisphere in running supplies into Central American nations, they had met us on battlefields around the world where they met us with Russian-made equipment in Vietnam, in Korea, and in Afghanistan we met them with American help for the Afghan freedom fighters. We had fought in proxy wars around the world during this cold war. Their intent toward the United States changed so quickly that none of our intelligence people, at least the ones I talked to, the presumably really smart ones, none of them predicted the falling of the Berlin Wall. People laughed at the idea that President Ronald Reagan went to the Berlin Wall and said, "Mr. Gorbachev, bring this wall down," and yet within a few months it happened. Their intent can go from a benign intent toward the United States to an aggressive intent toward the United States just as quickly. They have the apparatus, they have the nuclear weapons still. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WELDON] said so eloquently, if they are not aimed at the United States it takes 30 seconds to re-target them. That means that a Soviet missile specialist sitting in a silo can re-aim those nuclear weapons at cities in the United States as quickly as the average rifle shot at the Olympic rifle marksmanship trials can lift his rifle up and aim it at a bull's-eye. That is how fast the Russians can re-target. We have China trying to step into the superpower shoes that were left by the Soviet Union and their military is on the ascendancy. They are adding things like this missile destroyer. This missile destroyer has only one enemy in the entire world. It is designed specifically to destroy American ships and kill American sailors. They are doing that incidentally with the toy money and the other money that we send to

the tune of \$40 billion a year in surplus to Communist China.

Mr. Speaker, we live in a very dangerous world. The last thing that I think it is important for my colleagues to know is that while we are short on Marines, we are short on Army, we are short on Air Force, we are short on Navy in terms of force structure, we are also short on ammunition. The Army has certified to myself and to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SKELTON], who is the minority ranking member on the Subcommittee on Procurement, that they are \$1.6 billion short of what it takes in ammo to fight those two wars that we talked about. The Marine Corps has said in their letter that they are \$300 million short in ammo. They are 93 million M-16 bullets short of what it takes to fight those two wars we talked about. The point is we have entered a trough, a time of weakness, it is a historic cycle, a cycle down in this case for America in terms of defense spending. We need to boost it back up. I guess what I would ask all of my colleagues is to stick with us, stick with the few extra dollars that we put into this defense budget to give some modicum of support to the men and women who serve in our Armed Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is clear that our motto with respect to national security should be, "Be prepared." We are not prepared now if the intent of other nations around the world changes dramatically and suddenly. We owe it to the American people not to be ready to build a strong defense but to be ready with a strong defense already built in case we should have a war.

THE REPUBLICAN TAX CUT PLAN AND THE BUDGET BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to spend some time today, and know I have some of my colleagues, including the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], who has been really outspoken on this issue of why the Republican tax cuts which are part of the balanced budget package really are not fair to working families in this country. Of course the Democrats have come up with an alternative primarily targeting the tax cuts to working families. Really for those of us who voted for the balanced budget resolution and who have supported that plan over the last couple of weeks, it has been very disappointing to see the Republican leadership, particularly on the Committee on Ways and Means, come up with a tax bill that essentially does not do the right thing for America's working families. Because we believe, those of us who supported the balanced budget resolution, that in achieving a balanced budget, we have to do what is fair. We have to make sure that what-

ever tax cuts are implemented, primarily are targeted to help America's working families.

I am really concerned that the Republican leadership is doing just the opposite. Their tax bill would essentially phase out the alternative minimum tax for corporations which will cost taxpayers \$22 billion over the next 10 years. This is a tax on corporations that was passed in 1986 to stop many large, wealthy corporations from getting away with paying no taxes at all which is what we are going to go back to if the Republican leadership plan, their tax cut plan, goes through.

□ 1500

And while doling out this corporate welfare essentially, the Republican leadership has also decided to deny tax breaks for working families and also deny, and I want to stress deny, the minimum wage and basic worker protections for men and women they said had to get off welfare and go to work.

I do not know how this got into the bill, but in addition to the problems with the Republican tax cuts not helping working families, they have also put a provision in the reconciliation bill as part of their budget plan that would say that for those who are on workfare, those coming off of welfare as a result of the welfare reform, that they do not get minimum wage, and I think that is totally wrong. The whole idea of the welfare reform was to encourage people to work, to bring these people who are on welfare up to the standards, if you will, of the rest of the working population, and if you simply deny them minimum wage in the context of this overall plan, I think what you are doing is basically saying they are second-class citizens, and making them create competition between those who are already working, who are getting the minimum wage, to essentially bring down their wages as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, the Republican priorities I think are clear, and they are actually very bad for working people because the tax cuts are not for working people; the minimum wage, the lack of a minimum wage for people coming off welfare, does not encourage them to work, and the tax breaks again go for the wealthiest and most powerful corporations and individuals rather than for the working families of America.

We are going to be talking a lot more about this, but at this point, if she likes, I would yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO].

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey, and am glad to join with him this afternoon just to say that I look forward to all the opportunities that we have in the next several weeks to talk about the tax cut plan, because I think you stated it absolutely correctly.

There are two tax cut plans. The Republican majority has a tax cut plan, and the Democrats have a tax cut plan. This is not a question of one or the

other parties having a plan; we both concur like we did on a balanced budget agreement that in fact we ought to be able to provide tax relief, and the tax cut plan is a good opportunity for the public to take a look at who is on their side and who is on the side of working middle-class families in this country.

That is what the discussion is about because, again, there are two tax cut proposals that are on the table.

Just a footnote to what you were saying about the minimum wage, which is really quite extraordinary in that we pride ourselves in this country on rewarding people to work. We also passed a welfare reform bill in order to get people from welfare to work. That was the purpose of the legislation, and I think everyone concurs with that.

Now to say that if you are going to work, you cannot earn the minimum wage; that is astounding and outrageous, quite frankly, when you think about trying to reward people not for something they are not doing, which was the cry in the welfare situation and why we reformed welfare, but to get people from welfare to work, let us pay people the minimum wage, an honest day's pay for an honest day's work. I mean that is what we are all about in this country.

Let me go back to the tax proposal because, as my colleague from New Jersey has pointed out, the Republican tax proposal flat out, plain and simple hurts middle-class families. My colleagues from the other side of the aisle, they are going to stand in the well of this House, and they are going to talk otherwise. Let me just give you two or three facts about the Republican proposal and then two or three facts about the Democratic proposal.

One, the Republican bill hurts working women by slashing the child tax credit for 6 million families. The Republican bill hurts seniors by providing only \$600 million for low-income seniors to pay for rising Medicare premiums. What is necessary, and these are low-income seniors who are assisted with paying their Medicare premiums, what is required in the bipartisan balanced budget agreement. Now understand, people must understand that in a bipartisan way we said we were going to have a balanced budget agreement, and we agreed in that bill, with lots of weeks of turmoil and tribulation and going back and forth, to come to a balanced budget agreement. Within there it is said that we need \$1.5 billion in order to help seniors, low-income seniors.

This is nothing new. This was agreed to. The Republican majority has reneged on that agreement with regard to seniors.

The Republican bill hurts working families by denying the minimum wage to those struggling to make the transition from welfare to work.

The Republican bill hurts students. It provides, their bill provides, \$15 billion; I repeat, \$15 billion less for the

education initiatives that were once again agreed to in a bipartisan way by the President and by the House and the Senate. This was agreed to. Students are hurt by providing \$15 billion less in financial assistance to assist working families in getting their kids to school.

Take a look at their proposal, and you take a look at who is being helped by the congressional majority's proposal: big business and the wealthy. There are two or three examples, and my colleague from New Jersey already mentioned one of them. The bill helps big business, the biggest, largest, most prosperous corporations in the country. By scaling back something called the alternative minimum tax, it scales back their tax obligation by \$22 million. This tax was supposed to ensure that large corporations pay at least some income tax, but now the Republicans want to scale it back, and then they want to phase it out completely for some businesses.

I might add here that this was tried in the last session of the Congress as a part of the Contract With America, the repeal of the alternative minimum tax, causing such an outcry in the country that they shelved it for a while. They now brought it back. Again a week ago there was an outcry, but what they did was they called for the repeal. There were people who said this is outrageous. Even some of the members of the Republican conference said that it was outrageous. How can we go to the floor of the House, one Member said, and defend the largest corporations in the country not paying a single dime in taxes when working families are paying taxes?

So what they did was that they retreated somewhat from that, so what they are doing is they are giving them a gift, but they just scaled back somewhat on the gift that they are giving them. This is really outrageous. These are the most prosperous corporations in the country. In 1986 we said let us just put in a floor so that you will be paying taxes like everyone else, and now they want to begin to phase it out. At the same time they are telling parents, men and women who are in the workplace, that they are going to cut in half their opportunity to take a dependent child care tax credit. They are going to cut that back in half for working families today and provide the biggest corporations in this country with a windfall profit.

The Republican bill helps the rich by providing tax breaks for the wealthiest of Americans. Over half of the tax benefits from this bill go to the top 5 percent of Americans, those making more than \$250,000 a year.

These are simply the facts. These can be looked at, and people do not have to take my word or your word or anyone else's word. They can take the documents, they can look at the commentary on the documents, and they will find that these are the simple facts about the Republican tax proposal.

Let me make an additional comment in response to my colleague on the

other side of the aisle [Mr. KINGSTON]. This morning he referred to the families who receive the earned income tax credit as being, quote, on welfare, and I have a high regard for my colleague from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON]. I just want to remind him that earned income tax credit means that people are earning an income before they are allowed any kind of tax credit. Earned income; this is a tax credit for working people.

My colleague from Texas [Mr. ARCHER] also said the other day that millions of working families call the earned income tax credit the EITC welfare program. The earned income tax credit is not welfare. It is a tax break for low-income families who work. Once again, it is a tax break for low-income families who are working. These folks are working hard, they are playing by the rules, only to be criticized as receiving welfare simply because they do not happen to make a lot of money; they are not the richest corporations in this country.

My colleagues' comments speak volumes about whose side they are on in this budget debate. The Republicans are not on the side of average Americans if they consider tax relief for working families' welfare. This is clear by their willingness to give huge tax breaks to the wealthy and to big business at the expense of average working families.

I just want to make one other point, and I will yield back to my colleague, because I said that there is a Democratic tax cut proposal that is on the table. It has been designed very, very carefully in order to provide working middle-class families with tax cuts and tax breaks. The Democratic tax bill provides the majority of its tax benefits to families making less than \$100,000 a year. The tax bill, the tax cut package, includes \$37 billion for tax credits to help students to pay for college, truly making it a reality in this country that we will have not just 12 years of universal education, but 14 years of universal education, and this is through a HOPE scholarship program.

The Democratic tax bill provides relief to small businesses through capital gains that is targeted specifically to small businesses, to family-owned businesses, homeowners, to farmers, in the form of targeted capital gains and estate tax cuts. The homeowners' capital gains tax cut is in the Democratic alternative.

Finally, what the Democratic bill does not do, it does not balloon the deficit in the later years. So after the first 5 years you will not see the deficit, which we have worked so hard to decrease, balloon out of sight once again, thereby defeating everything that we did since the 1993 budget that only Democrats supported in this body, which allowed for interest rates to come down and provided us with the opportunity today in order to have a balanced budget agreement and to be able to have a tax cut program.

The Democratic bill does not balloon the deficit. In fact, the Democratic bill is the only proposal on the table that in fact is a balanced budget which phases balance into the next century.

In this budget debate it is clear that what we have got to determine and the public has got to determine is who is on whose side. Republicans are on the side of big business and the wealthy, and it is the Democrats that can say to the average working middle-class American family that we are on your side. And quite honestly, that is where we ought to be. We ought to be with people who are trying desperately to pay their bills, scrambling every week to get those bills paid, to get their kids to school. They are worried about the cost of health care, and they are worried about their pension and their retirement security.

That is where our obligation is, and I am proud to say that that is, in fact, where the Democratic tax cut proposal is.

I thank my colleague for calling this special order today, and I am happy to participate with him.

Mr. PALLONE. I just want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Again what the gentlewoman is saying and what all the Democrats are saying here is that in the context of this balanced budget resolution what we want to do is augment the middle class. The middle class, the working class, is really what defines America. It is why this country is so much greater and has been so much more successful than other countries, because we have this huge middle class. And so what we are saying is that with the limited resources that we have available pursuant to this balanced budget resolution we want to make sure that those tax cuts go to increase the middle class and to make the middle class and the working class a larger and larger group.

Now I think that the gentlewoman in particular by focusing on the struggling working people, you know those who are at the lower end we are trying to get off welfare, those are the ones in particular that we have to try to help. You know, that is the whole idea of the welfare reform, to get people off welfare. But they are only going to get off welfare and have an incentive to get off welfare if on the one hand they are paid a decent wage. I would maintain that a minimum wage is not even a decent wage, but at least it is a beginning, and that they have a place where they can provide child care for their kids while they work, and everything that is being done by the Republicans that addresses these struggling working-class people is essentially to their detriment. We have this earned income tax credit which has been a major incentive to get people off welfare and stay off welfare.

□ 1515

To the extent that people are penalized because they are getting that, it is

detrimental to the goal of getting more people into the middle class. To the extent that they are penalized because they are poor and they are trying to take advantage of a child tax credit and they cannot juxtapose that with the earned income tax credit, again, it is a disincentive for them to work and for them to get off welfare.

So I think that the gentlewoman is right on board there when she is talking about these things. Of course the biggest aspect is the minimum wage. If one says that people who are getting off welfare are not going to get the minimum wage, if we take that away, and we take away the advantages of a child tax credit and create disincentives for the earned income tax credit, we are basically making it more difficult for those struggling working class people, the very opposite of what we should be trying to do with this legislation.

At this point I would like to yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from New Jersey for this special order to talk about the tax cut bill. My colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE], and I serve on the Committee on Commerce, and last week we spent many hours in markup and voting on the Medicare portion and Medicaid and children's health care portion of the budget agreement.

My concern today is the medical savings account and the cost that it will have. A little brief history maybe. Last year under the Kassebaum-Kennedy bill, where we had portability and dealt with MSA, as a pilot program for medical savings accounts, MSA's were allowed for half a million people. MSA's, medical savings accounts, are allowed today even without that. If I wanted to go out right now and set up a high deductible health care plan, I could go buy it.

What the bill last year did is say OK, we are going to take 500,000 people and we are going to give them a tax deductibility, like an IRA, for their medical savings account. Now, the majority Republicans in the House want to do this for Medicare. But again, let me go back and do some comparisons between medical savings accounts and standard insurance.

Medical savings accounts, again, one could do it without any authorization from Congress, but the tax deductibility is the thing that makes it attractive, whereas last year the average wage-earner in our districts across the country that may pay \$200 or \$300 a month for their insurance, for their children's insurance, for example, they do not receive any deductibility for that. So if one has \$5,000 to put away, we are giving a deduction. But if one has to pay for one's insurance, \$200 or \$300 or \$400 at a time, one does not get that deduction. So all I think we ought to have is fairness.

It was wrong last year, but it is even more wrong with Medicare, because

under Medicare it is actually costing us \$2 billion of tax money to do a pilot program for half a million senior citizens who are on Medicare. Again, it is not like those seniors have \$5,000 put away. It is the Government that is going to give them their money for their medical savings accounts, so that is why it is going to cost us for a pilot program \$2 billion.

It is not those seniors' money, it is everybody's money to do it. Medical savings accounts were sold to us as a way that we could control our own health care. And maybe it works, but the only reason it will work is that, if we give a tax deductibility for people who are non-Medicare, and on Medicare, we are actually paying them to do that.

The way it works, the 500,000 pilot program under MSA's for Medicare is that Federal tax dollars will pay for \$5,000, and they will buy that down, for whatever they do to go to the doctor. What they have left in a certain year, then they get to take that. There is very little control, as we heard in committee last week, that if I was 66 years old and wanted to do a medical savings account, I would apply and be accepted into the pilot program, I guess. And if I only used \$1,000, then I could apply for the remainder of that. If I wanted to buy a boat with it, if I wanted to do whatever I wanted to with it, there are no restrictions in this bill.

The problem most of us have is that the average Medicare recipient today costs, on the average, both the people who need a lot of help from Medicare and the people who are healthy Medicare recipients, is about \$1,600. So it is a bad deal for the taxpayers to pay \$5,000 to somebody who may only be on the average using \$1,600 during the year. That \$2 billion is part of this balanced budget agreement, that is what bothers me.

Now, there are lots of things I may disagree with, and some of them I may support in the proposal we are going to consider. But the MSA's is a tax cost, and it is tax dollars that are being used to experiment that we can experiment and do options for a lot cheaper than \$2 billion. We ran with amendments in committee, and I think my colleague and I both voted for a smaller pilot program, one that costs a lot less. We lost on basically a party line vote. That is the frustration.

Mr. Speaker, we all want choice in our health care, whether one is a Medicare recipient or whether one is just someone else out here buying on the open market for health care. We want choice. But the choice should be our choice, but the choice also should be our assets or our costs that one is dealing with.

Now, if we want to give a tax deductibility for people on health care, then I hope to, and maybe that ought to be one of the tax reform measures. Let us give a tax cut to people who are having to buy insurance. The gentleman and I know that there are great examples of

employers all over the country because of the cost of health care for their employers, maybe at one time they gave both dependent care and their employees; but because of the high cost of insurance, they have cut back and they say well, we will pay for their employee's coverage, but their employee has to pay for this dependent care.

Why do we not give a tax deduction in this bill for that dependent care? We would see more children insured, more dependents insured, spouses who are at home who may not be eligible for health care through an employer; but that is not considered. We are going to spend \$2 billion of tax dollars for an experiment on Medicare on MSA's, medical savings accounts, and it just does not make budget sense.

That is the frustration. It is not GENE GREEN or Democrats in Congress saying that it is costing \$2 billion. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that these medical savings accounts would cost \$2 billion over the 5-year budget period.

Only in Washington, and we heard this last week in our committee, only in Washington could a \$2 billion cost say that is cost containment. To me, we ought to be able to save money on that and not spend \$2 billion.

MSA's, or medical savings accounts, in a sense are a voucher for seniors' health care, and it is more expensive for the Government because not every senior uses that \$5,000. Again, my seniors in Houston, just like my colleague's in New Jersey, are smart enough to know to say: Well, wait a minute, I am healthy, I do not need to go to the doctor every day or every month, I will apply to that, and if I do not use that \$5,000, that is money in my pocket. So that is tax money, though. I want them to have the money in their pocket but not when we are having to take away from other programs to have to do it.

A good example of taking away: One part of the budget agreement that I thought was good that we again failed on in the committee process was to have a program on the Medigap, or the supplemental insurance for senior citizens. So often, Medicare costs them \$43, \$45 a month, Medicare part B. That will go up under the program, although it will go up a small amount every year. The high cost to seniors today, though, is what their supplemental insurance is costing them. So there are a lot of seniors who are poor seniors who do not have the money to pay \$200 a month for their supplemental policy.

That is the problem in part of the budget agreement, was to save those seniors who are poor that would be paid their supplemental insurance, would be paid through Medicaid. But we lost again on that amendment last week that would say well, wait a minute. The budget agreement said that these costs are going to go up.

Let us take care of poor seniors who cannot afford the supplemental plan. What do we have? We lost on that. So

we have a lot of seniors who are going to, may see a substantial increase in their costs and cannot afford it. That is why a lot of us on both sides of the aisle, I know I do as a Democrat, want to see a balanced budget. But what is coming out of our committees, whether it be our Committee on Commerce, whether it be out of the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on Agriculture or Committee on Education and the Workforce, is something that I cannot support because the devil is in the details.

We support a balanced budget. But when we see the details that are coming out of some of our committees, that is when we are going to say wait a minute, that is not the agreement that was made 3 weeks ago or a month ago, that is not the criteria, that is not the framework that we talked about. When we are not taking care of seniors, who cannot afford the supplements, when we are experimenting with \$2 billion of tax dollars for medical savings accounts, that is \$2 billion.

I hear all the time from our conservative talk show folks that say, it is not your money to spend. This \$2 billion is not my money, it is not our money, it is tax dollars that we should not be experimenting with, tax dollars for medical savings accounts. It is not a good program. And I would hope that, although we will not have a vote on the floor on that amendment, I would hope the conference committee and the Senate would look at this and say that \$2 billion can be used for other purposes, or maybe send it back to the folks for more tax reduction, or maybe help balance the budget sooner than 2002, which also brings up a concern.

I worry about the tax agreement or the budget agreement, \$85 billion in tax cuts that we have. We have lost our goal, to balance the budget. And I worry that we are going down that same road that happened in the early 1980's where the last major tax cut was 1981, and yet we saw the budget deficit balloon during the 1980's because of a lack of budget discipline. I hope that we are not making that mistake here in this Congress.

So I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey for having this special order but also for allowing me to participate in it today.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the statements that the gentleman from Texas made, and if I could just elaborate on these MSA's and what is happening with Medicare with the MSA's. I find it incredible.

The gentleman, of course, listened to the earlier debate that we had where we were discussing the fact that as part of that balanced budget resolution, we wanted to make sure that scarce resources, in this case the tax cuts, went to working class people, working families in this country, and not to corporations or the wealthy.

Well, here again, we are seeing the same thing on the other side. That was the tax cut side. This is of course the

entitlement or the spending side, if you will, to some extent, and here we are seeing the same thing happen again. MSA's, medical savings accounts, were not part of the balanced budget resolution.

The idea was that we were going to have to cut back on the amount of money we spent on Medicare and Medicaid, because we knew that entitlements were ballooning and that, if we did not make some cuts in those entitlements, that the programs would not be there in the future, because we do not want Medicare and Medicaid to become insolvent. We want them to be there for future generations.

So we all reluctantly, I know the gentleman and I reluctantly agreed to some of these cuts in Medicare and Medicaid. But in the context of that, to come along with a totally new program now, medical savings accounts, which really do absolutely nothing but take more money away from Medicare, I think, is unconscionable. I really do, because what we are basically saying is that we are going to cut, if you will, another \$2 billion that is going to be possibly taken out of the Medicare Program, when we already know that it is a problem taking some of the cuts that it is taking under this budget resolution; and we are going to give that money, in my opinion, primarily to wealthy people.

I say that because, as the gentleman said, who is going to take advantage of this program? Basically what we are telling this individual is this: If you take the money that it costs on an annual basis for Medicare, for the average person, and we give you that money and you go out and buy a catastrophic health care policy just to cover you in case you have a catastrophic illness, then you keep that other money, what is left, in the bank. Say it cost \$1,500 for the catastrophic policy and you have another \$2,500 to play with, you keep that in your bank; and as you get sick, you pay for that in cash, essentially.

□ 1530

The average senior citizen, the average person over 65 who is going to be worried about how they are going to pay for their health care if they get sick is not going to take that risk.

The only person who will take that risk is, first of all, someone who is very healthy, and not too many over 65 are very healthy, and they have to have enough extra money, they have to have a lot of other money and be wealthy to know if they have to pay into it, if they have to go over that 25, that the money is available. So the only people who are going to take advantage of this are healthy and wealthy people. The other thing is if they do get sick, then a year later they can go back into the traditional Medicare.

What are we doing? Once again we are creating a huge hole in Medicare to give money back essentially to pretty much wealthy people, and then at the

same time, the Republicans have refused to pay for the premiums for the very poor people, we call them SLMBY's, who they promised in the budget agreement they were going to pay for.

So under this Republican proposal that came out of the Committee on Commerce, if I am somebody at the lower end, relatively poor, right now my Medicare Part B, my doctor bills, if you want, my doctors insurance, is paid for by Medicaid, OK? But the Republicans are saying, we are not going to do that because that is going to cost us \$1.5 billion, so you are on your own.

So what happens is the poor person cannot get the money to cover the Medicare Part B; the wealthy, healthy person now gets money back that they basically get as income to themselves from the taxpayer. I hate to say it because I do not like to talk in these terms, but basically what the Republican leadership has done is to say that we are going to help the wealthy, and we are not going to help the relatively poor struggling working people; again, the same thing that is happening with the tax cuts.

I just find it incredible that they are proposing this with a straight face. This was not part of the budget agreement. This does not do anything to help Medicare. It does not do anything, and if anything, it aggravates the potential problem in terms of insolvency for Medicare.

Mr. GREEN. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I guess my concern is we are losing the budget agreement in the effort with the details. Again, there are a lot of healthy senior citizens, and again, they are smart enough to know that they will not go get those tests if they feel good, if they know they can keep that money themselves.

But again, the average cost for a Medicare recipient in our country today, the average cost of everyone, is \$1,600 a year. If you give the healthiest an opportunity to have a medical savings account that is paid for by the Government, paid for by the Government, that is deductible in their premium, then they are going to take it.

My concern is over a period of years, we heard last year the denials that Medicare would wither on the vine. This may be, now it may be baby steps to get Medicare to wither on the vine, because let us take money out of Medicare and put it in an experimental program for \$2 billion. Next year it might be something else they want to do, or something else. So they are taking money out.

Again, we know Medicare has to be reformed. We know we want the trust fund, I want the trust fund to be solvent after 2010, because frankly, I am going to be 65 sometime after that time. I want Medicare to be there not only for my dad, but for me and also for my children.

But we do not do it by taking money out of the system and experimenting

with it, and maybe calling into question the whole senior citizen health care program that has been with us since 1965 and has been one of the greatest things our Government has ever done for seniors. It shows, because that is also the ever-increasing population. People are living longer, and it is also because both they are healthier and also they have Medicare to take care of people.

I want to thank the gentleman for taking his time for this special order, not just on the medical savings account, but also on the whole tax bill, because there are things in there that I would like to vote for, but things like MSA's make it to the point where I just cannot vote for it. If they are in there, with the lack of the SLMBY help for the senior citizens, then I would hope the President would also make that determination and veto it if it actually gets to his desk with those in there.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's comments. I just want to talk a little bit more about the MSA's, because I think the gentleman made a very good point about how the MSA's actually, in the long run, may hurt or even kill the Medicare program. Many of our Republican colleagues, including the Speaker, who made the comment about how Medicare should wither on the vine, essentially have been indicating over the years their lack of support for the Medicare Program.

I think in many ways what is happening here with the MSA's, with the medical savings accounts, is an effort to try to ultimately destroy the Medicare Program. I am not going to say it is always intentional on the part of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, but the effect is the same.

Let me just give a little bit of information in that regard. First of all, the whole idea of an insurance pool, and the whole idea of Medicare, because it essentially is an insurance pool, is that you have both healthy people as well as sick people, and everyone in the middle. In other words, you finance the system, if you will, by having as many people as possible who are healthy as well as sick, because the idea is that having a lot of healthy people in the overall insurance pool provides money that can be paid out to those who get sick.

If you break that system, if you separate the healthy from the sick and essentially put the healthy into medical savings accounts so Medicare, now the traditional Medicare, only has sick people, you are essentially breaking the insurance pool, and you are driving up the costs of the Medicare Program for those who are left in it, the people who are essentially sick.

What essentially MSA's do is the antithesis of what health insurance is meant to be, financial protection for the sick. You break the insurance pool and you make it much more difficult for Medicare to exist as a viable program.

Just to consider an example of how the MSA's would drain Medicare, 10 percent of the sickest costs Medicare, per beneficiary, \$37,000. Ninety percent of the healthiest costs Medicare, per beneficiary, \$1,400; and the cost of the average Medicare enrollee is \$5,000.

So if 90 percent of the healthiest seniors, whose actual health care costs are far lower than the average cost Medicare pays per beneficiary enrolled in MSA's, then ultimately what would happen is the increased cost to Medicare for the coverage for the healthy beneficiary would be \$3,600, more than double the present costs. Medicare MSA's would drain the funds meant to pay for the sick and would provide a windfall, essentially, to the healthy.

What we are going to see in the long run with MSA's is essentially what I call a death spiral for the Medicare Program. Payments to SMA enrollees will divert funds from traditional Medicare, leave behind higher costs for Medicare enrollees. To meet budget targets, this will lead to cuts in provider payments and possible benefit cuts. The next year the cycle will continue, and eventually the cycle will continue to drive relatively healthy seniors into MSA's, drive up traditional Medicare costs, cut provider payments in traditional Medicare, and drive doctors away from serving patients enrolled in traditional Medicare. This could ultimately lead to the demise of the Medicare Program. I am afraid that that is what we are going to see with the MSA's.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back, if I could, for a few minutes to the tax cut plan, and why the Democratic alternative is so much better than what the Republicans have put forward.

If I could just talk about two aspects of this, one is what the Republicans have done in their tax cut plan to essentially attack the struggling working families, people who are just getting out of welfare, that are trying to work. The second thing I would like to talk about is how the two plans, the Democrat versus the Republican plans, differ on capital gains and estate taxes, because I think that is where we see the difference in terms of Democrats trying to help working families and Republicans primarily trying to help the very, very wealthy.

As far as this Republican attack on struggling working families, again, going back to the earned income tax credit, to the minimum wage aspect, and to the children in day care, in a letter to President Clinton, the Committee on Ways and Means chairman said that he would not give his \$500 child tax credit to millions of working families because they "already receive Tax Code benefits through the earned income tax credit welfare program," referring to the earned income tax credit as a welfare program.

Again, I think that is totally inaccurate, because the earned income tax credit is for struggling working parents. People would be shocked to hear

themselves described as on welfare when they are paying taxes. Essentially I think this is the Republican strategy. In order to give as many tax breaks as possible to the wealthy, they have to keep putting down low- and middle-income families, and they make them seem undeserving of tax credits.

The other thing is that the GOP bill punishes working parents for placing children in day care. We talked about this a little bit. Families eligible for this same earned income tax credit are not the only ones that the Republican tax bill shortchanges. The House Republicans refuse to give their child tax credit to parents who deduct child care expenses from their taxes, effectively punishing working moms and dads for putting their kids in day care.

Then, of course, the last piece of this is the effort, this sneak attack, if you would, on the minimum wage is saying people who are in workfare, who are coming off welfare, would not be paid a minimum wage.

What I am saying, again, is if we look at the Republican plan it does the opposite of what is necessary to get people off welfare and to help the struggling working class people at the lower end of the spectrum, but who are still working, because it makes it more difficult, more difficult for them to get day care, more difficult to keep money they would get through the earned income tax credit, and more difficult for them to earn a decent wage because they are no longer necessarily going to be paid the minimum wage.

I just wanted to talk a little bit, though, also about the two tax cuts that I think in many ways are at the heart of this Republican effort to try to benefit the wealthy at the expense of the middle class. That is the capital gains tax cut and the estate tax.

In the Senate Finance Committee plan put forward by Senator ROTH with regard to capital gains, the top rate on capital gains from the sale of stocks, bonds, or other assets would drop to 20 percent from 28 percent, so again, the Republicans are looking at capital gains cuts across-the-board, stocks, bonds, or whatever assets, and they are dropping the rate from 28 percent to 20 percent.

Up to \$500,000 of the gains from the sale of a home would be exempt for married couples. Currently the tax can be deferred if the gain is rolled over into purchasing of another home. What the Democrats, or I should say the President's response is, President Clinton's response to the Senate Republican plan, was to basically say that capital gains breaks should be narrowly targeted to homeowners and middle-income families.

That is not to say that we would not like to give a tax break to people who have large portfolios of stocks and bonds, but we have a very limited amount of resources here. If we are going to have tax cuts that are going to help working families, they should be narrowly targeted to homeowners.

That is essentially what the President has been saying and what the Democrats have been saying.

What the Democrats have proposed in their alternative with regard to capital gains for homeowners is it permits homeowners to sell their homes at a loss, and to deduct those losses, up to \$250,000, from their taxes. The Democratic tax alternative permits homeowners to not be taxed on the first \$500,000 of gain from the sale of a house, again, as in the President's budget.

With regard to small businesses and farms, the Democrats provide a targeted tax cut for capital gains income. The Democratic alternative cuts the rate from 28 percent to 18 percent for certain capital gains income, and it is targeted only to those who sell real estate, farms, and small businesses after 3 years.

Let us go to the estate tax, because again this is where we see the big discrepancy between the Republicans and the Democrats. On the estate tax, the Roth plan, the Republican plan, says the amount an estate can pass on without paying tax would gradually be increased up to \$1 million of small business, and family farms would be exempt from estate tax.

What the President says in response to that is that estate tax relief should be offered only to small businesses and family farms, not to the well-to-do.

What does the Democratic alternative propose? It is narrowly targeted, focusing on family-opened businesses that make our country thrive. For a couple, the Democratic bill increases the amount that a family can pass down at death from \$1.2 to \$2.0 million, and targets it only on family-owned businesses.

So again, the question here again is where are we going to give the tax relief? Where are we going to make the changes and provide tax relief? The answer, the Democrats say for working families, not for the wealthy. Please, let us not again phase out the alternative minimum tax for corporations, because again, the Republicans there once again show that they prefer large corporations and the wealthy for their tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mrs. CLAYTON].

ACTIVITIES SURROUNDING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST MINORITY FARMERS WITHIN THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to bring to my colleagues' attention a high priority matter for rural and minority communities, the recent important activities surrounding the longstanding problem of discrimination against minority farmers within the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Indeed, widespread unfair, unequal treatment of socially disadvantaged and minority farmers have been well documented for more than three decades.

□ 1545

A GAO report, an inspector general's report, and an exhaustive Civil Rights Action Team report called CRAT are just the latest in a series of government initiatives examining this problem. This issue was first raised in 1965 when the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights established that the USDA discriminated both in internal employee actions and external program delivery activities.

An ensuing USDA employee focus group in 1970 reported that USDA was callous in their institutional attitude and demeanor regarding civil rights and equal opportunity.

In 1982, the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights examined this issue a second time and published a report entitled "The Decline of Black Farming in America." The commission concluded that there was widespread prejudicial practices in loan approvals, loan servicing and farm management assistance as administered by the Farmers Home Administration.

However, as no improvement was forthcoming, this matter was investigated again in 1990, by the House Governmental Operations Committee, chaired by our colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CONYERS]. Ironically, the same conclusion was reached in 1990 as had been reached in 1982, that the Farmers Home Administration had been a catalyst in the decline of minority farming. That conclusion is found in the Conyers report entitled "The 'Minority Farmer, A Disappearing Resource; Has The Farmers Home Administration Been The Primary Catalyst?'"

Then in January 1997, the General Accounting Office published a report entitled "Farm Programs: Efforts to Achieve Equitable Treatment of Minority Farmers." While much of the report was inconclusive due to its limited scope, GAO did find instances of discrimination. GAO also found that the disapproval rate for loans was 6 percent higher, 6 percent higher for minority farmers than the rate for nonminority farmers.

The very next month, two related reports were released. The Office of Inspector General Evaluation Report for the Secretary on Civil Rights Issues and the Civil Rights Action Team Report. The authors of these hard-hitting reports came to the identical conclusion as those that had looked at this issue some 32 years previously. There are significant problems with discrimination within the Department of Agriculture.

The CRAT report by the USDA identified discrimination among various minorities, including women farmers, Hispanics, Asian and American Indian farmers.

In addition, in November of last year, FSA Administrator Grant Buntrock stated in a public speech: "We recognize there has been instances of discrimination in responding to requests for our services in the past, and we deplore it."

Throughout his tenure, Secretary Glickman has continued to display a firm intent to promote changes at the USDA. However, change, the kind of change which is needed in this situation, is very difficult and very demanding. It is my hope and it is the hope of many of my colleagues in Congress, as well as the hope of minorities across the United States, that Congress will provide Secretary Glickman with the kind of support he will need if indeed true change within the USDA is realized.

To this end, we must enact legislation making some public commitment about this matter, particularly as we are in discussion about race and better race relations.

In that way we will demonstrate that rooting out discrimination at USDA is a national priority, not just words to be in a report. And we will give the current effort the kind of boost that is required to begin to bring closure to a chapter in our national history that should have been closed long ago.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will correct this discrimination pattern that has gone on far too long and make sure all Americans, all farmers, regardless of their gender, regardless of their race, regardless of locality, will have equal access both to the grant resources as well as the program resources.

THE DEATH TAX

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest to all of the different speakers today in the special orders. Many of them have been talking about the different tax breaks and tax cuts that we are discussing now. I find it very encouraging that after a long period of time we are finally getting around to talking about giving a break to the American people, something that they have needed for a long time.

Every once in a while there comes a point when an issue comes to the fore and its time has truly come. I think that issue for many Americans is going to center around what I consider the death tax. Some people call it inheritance tax. Some people call it an estate tax. But it is truly in every sense of the word a death tax.

At a point in a person's life when they do not need another emotional blow or financial blow, they have been touched by a circumstance where someone dies. All of a sudden the Government comes in and says, by the way, we are going to add to your misery. What we want to do is disrupt your entire life, and that is especially true for hard-working men and women all over this country.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a little story. It is about a lady, Idaho rancher named Lee Ann Ferris, who experienced the most devastating event in

her life after her father's death, which was terrible, in 1993. But it was followed by this. Her accountant told her that there would be no way to keep the ranch when her mother passed away. She was quoted as saying, I was like a dazed deer looking in the headlights. How could this be? We owned this land. We paid this land off.

Ferris related her story in testimony before the other body, and she was testifying on the death taxes. Proponents of tax reform say that it is needed to help family farms and businesses survive and promote traditional values. Ferris told the other body's committee that the accountant explained to her that, upon her mother's death, the heirs would be liable for \$3.3 million in taxes on an operation that was only taking in \$350,000 a year.

She then talked about costly estate planning, part of which involved buying a life insurance policy for her elderly mother solely for the purpose of paying off a third of the estate tax. That would still leave the family with a \$2 million-plus tax bill. Millions of Americans, farmers, ranchers, small business people, private property owners face a similar grim situation. If the estate assets are worth more than \$600,000, the Federal Government, in classic ambulance chaser style, will come calling for what it claims is its share as soon as the funeral is over.

Farmers and ranchers work long, hard hours over a lifetime to build their businesses, says Charles Kruse, a member of the American Farm Bureau Federation board of directors and president of the Missouri Farm Bureau Federation. Quote, often farm heirs must sell business assets to pay estate taxes. When taxes drain capital from a farm business, the profit-making ability of the farm is destroyed and the farm business dies. Farmers and ranchers should be able to save for the future without having to worry about sharing the outcome of their efforts with the Federal Government, especially after already paying a lifetime of income taxes. Along the way they paid income taxes on their earnings. It is wrong to tax those earnings again at death.

Mr. Speaker, I must tell my colleagues, as I look at this death tax and what we do as a Federal Government to the American people, it is truly what I consider immoral. How did we get to this point? I think that it has been a gradual process through the years. Historically, prior to 1916, we would have inheritance taxes from time to time. They normally occurred at times of war when our export market was basically hurt and we were not getting the revenue that we needed. So from a national security standpoint, we would enact as a Congress an inheritance tax to bring in more money to the Federal Treasury in order to maintain our national security. That made a tremendous amount of sense.

That occurred over 100 years, our first 100 years as a nation. But in 1916, we put into place a death tax that has

pretty much remained constant throughout the years. The death tax was established in 1916 basically to redistribute wealth to prevent certain families from amassing the majority of the Nation's riches. However, as is the case in most tax schemes aimed at the rich, the extremely wealthy find a way to stay extremely wealthy in spite of the tax. And the middle class, the small business entrepreneurs, are the ones who struggle. They are the ones that are hurt. They are the ones that have to bear the brunt of this tax policy.

If we look at the death tax, as far as what it does to the Federal budget, roughly, we take in about 1 percent of our total revenue, our total annual revenue that comes in from estate taxes. My personal view is that the death tax is not worth the devastation it causes to family farms and family businesses and to the entrepreneurship that is at the very heart of our Nation.

Furthermore, less than one-seventh of 1 percent of total revenue comes from death taxes on closely held businesses and farms. Farmers expect that repealing death taxes would induce them to invest in their businesses in ways that would enable revenue to grow 5 percent faster.

We see the results of the death tax being a burden on the growth in business. More money is spent within our national economy to prevent family businesses from being destroyed by death tax obligations than is being collected by the Federal Government in the form of tax revenues.

We hear that over and over again. There are individuals in this country, lawyers and accountants, who make their living trying to figure out ways in order to save family farms and family businesses. It is heard over and over again. These individuals make a very good living at their profession. They spend all of their time trying their best to create an environment so this business can just be maintained.

A 1996 study by the Heritage Foundation found that repealing death and gift taxes would produce dramatically positive effects in the American economy over the next 9 years. The Nation's economy would average as much as \$11 billion per year in additional output and an average of 145,000 additional jobs would be created. Personal income would rise by an average of \$8 billion per year above current projections. And finally, the deficit would actually decline due to the growth generated by the abolishment of the death tax.

This tax, and there are individuals, by the way, in our society who do not realize, some of them own businesses, some of them are starting businesses, they do not realize what is going to happen to them when they die, what is going to happen to this business that they have sweated for and hurt for and they have sacrificed their families for.

□ 1600

They are doing this for their families and for their future.

This tax, and we have to understand how much it is, is 37 to 55 percent of the present value of the business. It makes the death of the owner and the death of the small business one and the same. Nearly 80 percent of failed family businesses that enter bankruptcy go bankrupt after the unexpected death of the founder. And high death tax rates force some heirs to sell businesses, break up that business or liquidate most of their assets or all of their assets.

Any of these options is devastating to a community. It is devastating to the employees of that business and to their surviving owners. And let me point out one thing. When we talk about being devastated, we are talking about, for example, a family farm, where an individual buys land, he has a cost basis in that land, and the land has been in the family for 40 years. He has a cost basis in that land of a small amount. Let us say it is \$100 an acre. But because of inflation and different factors, that land has increased in value.

Now, understand that owner did not make it increase in value from the standpoint of inflation. We, as a government, created certain monetary policies, we did certain things that made the value of that land increase. So all of a sudden that land that began 40 years ago, that cost \$100, all of a sudden is now worth \$1,500 or \$2,000.

When that individual dies, we are talking about the Government coming in and saying, we created a problem by having inflation, and we increased the cost of this asset that is held by this individual. Now we are going to put this individual in a situation where they are going to have to pay us for the problem that we created. That is not fair.

Now, I have heard people today talk about they do not like the Republican tax bill. They have talked about the estate taxes, and people from the other side of the aisle have been complaining about the estate taxes. I have news for my colleagues. I do not like the Republican plan either, and the reason I do not like the Republican estate tax plan is because it still leaves it in the law. It decreases the amount, but it is still law that we have a death tax.

Mr. Speaker, I want to finish this one statement and then I am going to yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON].

What I want is the total elimination of the death tax. It has no business in our Tax Code. I believe it is un-American. I believe it is the most cruel tax that has ever been put on the American people.

And with that, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and knowing the interest of the gentleman from Mississippi in this death tax and the repeal of it, and I certainly appreciate his leadership, as do most taxpaying Americans, I wanted to bring an article sent

to me by Dr. Bert Loftman of Atlanta, that was in the Human Events magazine on April 18 of this year, written by Terence Jeffrey, and in that he goes into the history of the death tax.

The article points out that Lincoln imposed an emergency inheritance tax during the Civil War but that it was repealed in 1870, and the reason he did it was because of the national emergency of the Civil War. Also this article points out that in 1894 we had a temporary income tax, as well, but that was also repealed.

I guess the crowning blow that made this permanent was under President Wilson in 1913 when he ratified the 16th amendment that, of course, started the income tax law, but it also gave Congress the power to lay and collect taxes on income. Wilson followed that by cutting U.S. tariffs in half; to pay for or offset the revenue lost by imposing progressive taxes on the incomes of rich Americans.

So here we have historically how this tax came about, to give foreign traders a tax break, and how we increased the taxes on Americans.

What I hear over and over again, and I do not get calls from, say, the Rockefellers and the Morgans or the Ted Turners and the Bill Gates, I do not get those calls, but I do get calls from people who do not have big corporations and big titles. They say they have worked their rear end off for the last 50, 60, 70 years, and they have built up this family farm that has 1,800 acres right now. It has a house on it, and it is now worth \$1.5 million.

Now, these people paid for that farm through sweat equity and they paid taxes every single year this farm has been in existence, and now their son or daughter wants to start out being a family farmer but they cannot pass it on to them. So they have to go out and get a fancy lawyer or an accountant or an estate planner to come up with some way around the tax law so that they can pass what is already theirs, what they have already paid taxes on, to their own children so that they can be independent and continue being taxpayers themselves.

This is the fundamental American dream. For liberal colleagues of ours to sit over here with the President of the United States and say no to middle class America, to say "We want your taxes when you are born, when you are living, when you are working and when you are dying," that is ridiculous. The middle class in America deserve better.

While we are all mourning at the funeral, Uncle Sam is there counting his pennies. It is absolutely ridiculous. Let people die with dignity. Let them die knowing that their life and their labors have not been in vain but that they can pass it on to the next generation.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I want to tell the gentleman a story. I do not want to mention any names because I do not want to hurt anybody's feelings. On the other side of the aisle everybody al-

ways stands up and says, hey, this is for the wealthy, this is not for middle class America.

I want to tell my colleague what the wealthy do. The wealthy will take care of themselves, they always have and they always will. They hire high-priced lawyers and high-priced accountants and they get by and get around anything that Congress puts out.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let us point out, too, there are more millionaires in the Clinton cabinet than there were in other cabinets. If we want to talk rich and we want to talk class warfare, let us start with the Clinton cabinet.

Mr. PARKER. Well, I want the gentleman to understand that I do not have anything against people being rich. I do not mind it at all.

Let me tell the gentleman one of the problems we have. I will tell my colleague this story about a family. There is a family in this country, one of the wealthiest families we have. Everybody knows their name. They own some land, and they bought it dirt cheap.

Now, I had a farmer tell me one time, "There are a lot of things in the world that are dirt cheap, dirt ain't one of them," but I have news for my colleague: This particular family bought some land and they bought it cheap.

Now, on this land they put some hotels. Now, they did not pay much for this land, but what they did, they kept it through the years and they had these hotels on this land, and this was a pristine area. What they decided they would do is, they would turn around and they would give away the part that was not making money.

And they did, they gave literally thousands of acres to the Federal Government. Their lawyers and their accountants out of New York sat down and, smart people, they sat down and they devised this system where they were going to give the Government this land at that day's value but they were going to keep the moneymaking part. They were going to keep the hotels. They did.

Now, in this agreement they said, now, we are going to give the Government this land, and it is a national park now, but they said, we will give the Government this land, but they are going to maintain the roads to our hotels, they are also going to maintain the water, they are also going to maintain the sewer. They are going to take care of everything that costs us money, and they are going to maintain all the land around. All the land we give the Government, they are going to maintain it. It is a gift, but that is part of this transaction.

This family keeps all this lands, all these hotels, and they make a lot of money. A few years ago they decided they had depreciated all they could, made all they wanted to out of it, and they sold it to a big national corporation who now owns it.

Now, the point I am making is this: We cannot imagine the amount of taxes this very wealthy family did not

pay because of the way they handled this. They did not have to give this away to children or grandchildren. What they did is, they gave it to the Federal Government and they got a tremendous tax incentive by giving it away. Now, if they had given this same land to their children, they would have been penalized.

The point is that the wealthy in this country can get around the issue. They always have. The problem is the middle-class people who, all of a sudden, they do not know what they are worth. They may think their farm, because they are only making \$40,000 or \$30,000 a year off this farm, they think, well, this farm is not worth that much.

But whenever the IRS comes in, and they appraise that land and they appraise that equipment and they appraise that farm at a value which is at current standards, all of a sudden they realize they do not have enough money to pay this off. They are going to wind up selling this farm and being put out of business, not being able to continue, and their family devastated.

If their child wants to be a farmer, I am sorry, they have to start over again. The Federal Government is going to confiscate what they have spent their life working for. Now, that is unfair.

Mr. KINGSTON. Essentially, Abraham Lincoln made this statement, "that God must have loved the common man because he made so many of them." Unfortunately, Uncle Sam loves the common man, too, because that is who pays the taxes. It is not the poor, it is not the super rich. They get around it through foundations, through tax shelters, through whatever their lawyers and accountants can scheme up, but over and over again the common man pays the taxes and carries the whole load here.

I hear the same thing the gentleman hears. An individual's mama and daddy died, left an estate over \$600,000, and Uncle Sam came to the funeral first and got his share. Big dog sat down and he ate, and after he ate, what was left, these folks had to sell off whatever it was their parents had worked all their life for. Then they cannot operate that farm or family business any more because they had to sell a portion of it to pay the taxes.

So Uncle Sam, in his greed, cuts out a revenue generating enterprise. Just one more example of short-term greed and, I think, a horrible punitive tax policy.

We were all raised hearing that we should learn our lessons in school; go to school every day, do what is right and work, get that job, show up on time and do what our employer tell us to do, and one day we will be lucky enough to own something, own a house, own a farm, maybe own our own business. But now, because we do that, we get an organized group of say 150 liberals with the President of the United States saying that is bad, that is evil, these people are rich.

Well, we know these people are not Rockefeller rich, but they still have enough money that they are not dependent on the Government. Therefore, they are going to be punished when they are living and when they are dying. I think people in America have had enough.

Mr. PARKER. You know, this is what I find fascinating. If people sit and do absolutely nothing, refuse to move and are as lazy as they can be, the government will do anything they can to help them. The fascinating thing is that that individual who turns around and they work, as the President says, they play by the rules, they save, they reinvest, they do everything they can to be good taxpaying citizens, at the end of their time, when they have done all of this work and accumulated something, and let me just say they did not just accumulate it because it fell out of the trees, they accumulated it because they had a plan and they worked that plan and they applied themselves to save, and after they do this, the Federal Government says they have done a great job, and what the Government is going to do is they are going to now penalize them.

Now, personally, I think that is unfair. It is unfair to them, it is unfair to their children, and I think it sends the wrong message to the young people of this country who do not even realize what they are coming up against now. A lot of them, only 58 percent of the owners of small businesses even realize what their tax liability is going to be. Many of them do not.

One of the reasons is not because they do not want to know, but that they are busy running their businesses and building their businesses. They do not have enough money to turn around and pay accountants and pay lawyers to come in and give them an expensive way in order to get around the taxes that they are going to be faced with. They have no idea of what is coming.

Mr. KINGSTON. They do not.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Kansas, [Mr. TIAHRT].

□ 1615

I think my colleagues are carrying on a very interesting debate, and I would like to add a little bit of a personal story that came out of my life that adds to why I think we ought to change our tax structure here in America. I know we are talking about death taxes. But you know, we are taxed on the very first cup of coffee we drink in the morning. We are taxed on every gallon of gas we use to drive to work. We are taxed on the telephone when we use it to earn some money. We are taxed on the income we earn. We pay sales tax on the way home if we stop to buy something, pay property tax on our home. And then when we die, we have to pay death taxes. And I think it is wrong, and it is wrong for a couple reasons.

My colleagues talked earlier about the redistribution of wealth. I think we

ought to reward success in America. We want more success, and more success means that we will have people that will have money available that will invest and create more jobs. And this is a good thing. We want more jobs and more opportunity. But also, death taxes prevent parents from passing on their success to the next generation.

My grandpa was John W. Steele. He was born on a farm, and he spent his whole life on a farm. He had some good times and some bad times. In the 1920's they were very successful, and in the 1930's they lost it all, and in the 1940's they were struggling. And my grandpa, at the age of 67, I believe, borrowed enough money to buy the farm I grew up on, and he paid it off before he died in 1979 at the age of 94.

At the time when he died, land prices were a little bit elevated. And when the tax men looked at the property, they found 40 acres, a small plot that was near my home, and it had sold for about \$1,500 per acre. And so, they assessed \$1,500 per acre for this 1,200 acre farm, or two-section farm.

What happened is that my parents, Wilbur and Marcine Tiaht, and my aunt and uncle, John and Mary Ruth Armstrong, had to borrow the equivalent of about \$750 per acre to pay off the death taxes so that they could have the enjoyment of the success that my grandfather and his brother had in their farm.

Well, today that land is worth somewhere between \$900 and \$1,000 per acre. So not only did my grandfather and his brother borrow money and pay for this farm once, but my parents and my aunt and uncle have had to borrow and pay for that farm twice at an inflated value just to maintain the success that our forefathers enjoyed.

I can understand that we have to generate revenue for this Government. There are many wonderful things that we do in this Government. But we should not penalize success. We ought to encourage success. This is one way that people pass from one generation to the next the fruit of their labor.

So I would join with the gentleman and say that we ought to eliminate death tax in America.

Mr. PARKER. If the gentleman would yield, he brings up a great point. Let me just say something to that.

My land back home at my house, I have got 125 acres. Now, land is what it is worth on the market, it is worth what somebody is willing to pay for it. I have got a neighbor who bought some land close to me, and the point I am making is how these values are established. Now this guy has been successful. And I think the world of him. He is a good man. He established a Fortune 500 company. He has done well. But he has got enough money to burn, you know, to cremate a dead mule with hundred dollar bills. This guy has got a lot of money.

When he bought this land, he paid \$3,000 an acre for it, which is fine because he had the money to do it. The

problem is that if I had dropped dead right after this sale, the IRS would have come in and looked at the sale that occurred down the road and said, by the way, Parker, they would have told my wife, this 125 acres is worth \$3,000.

Now, I got news for my colleagues. Somebody who wants to pay \$3,000 for that land, they can have it. I will be more than happy to sell it. That is not the point. It is not worth that on the market. But the IRS would have looked at that, made a determination that was the value, and that is what my wife would have had to evaluate that land for. Now, that is wrong.

And let me point out, it is not only the Government that creates inflated prices. There are times when market forces create inflated prices. There is no reason for anybody to be caught in that situation. It can destroy you. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman.

I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON].

Mr. PAXON. I appreciate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER] having me here today to join with him and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. TIAHRT] in talking about what I believe was referred to as the death tax, is the death on jobs and opportunity tax.

Where I come from in western New York, the Buffalo and Rochester, NY, areas, our economy is built on small business and on family business. I come from a little village, Akron, NY, where the major employers in our community were all multigenerational family businesses that had been there since the turn of the century and before. And time and again, my little home town of Akron, NY, and Erie County and western New York, people tell me again and again that the biggest burden they face is trying to figure out a way to keep that business together so that the next generation can have an opportunity and the community can have an opportunity.

I flew back from Buffalo down here a while ago with a business person from Buffalo who was selling, in the process of disposing of a multigeneration family business that been in the family for I think five generations, and unfortunately, because of death taxes, found it necessary to do that, to dispose of the business, selling it to a company from outside of our country.

Eventually, I know what is going to happen, those jobs are going to move to another State, we are going to lose jobs in our community; and that is going to be terrible hardship to families. So all this effort, all this cost is going for what purpose? The death to jobs, opportunities for families. It just seems to me unconscionable.

I know, whether it is in Georgia or Mississippi or in New York State, the statistics are shocking. Seventy percent of family businesses do not survive through the second generation,

and 87 percent do not make it to the third generation. And again and again, I know my colleagues hear the same thing when they both go home, most of our Members do, the key reason for that is the burdens of death taxes and of trying to figure out a way to keep those businesses together; and it is much easier to dispose of them, to bring about the loss of jobs and opportunity in the community, than it is to try to get that down to the next generation.

We should be celebrating. I am the father of a little 1-year-old. And I think to myself, nobody in this country would take a 1-year-old child, walk him out to the corner of the street, and say, "Go find your way down to Aunt Mary's house," and walk back in the house and leave that child out there.

But that is what we do to that small business. We say to that small business, we really celebrate you, we love you; but find your way down the street. And in the meanwhile, the Government puts up every barrier to the growth of that small business, just as we would do to that child. We should celebrate those little kids and celebrate business starts. We should not penalize them from the day they start by saying, we are going to tax you to death; and when you die, we are going to take it back from you. It is just wrong.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman would yield, this is a very old story but it is a very good story, I guess that is why it has lasted so long, about the guy who is driving down the road and sees a farmer who has a pig. The pig has two wooden legs where the ham should be and he stops and says to the farmer, "I have got to ask you about that pig. I have never seen a pig with two wooden legs. What is going on here?"

He said, "Oh, let me tell you about that pig. That is a very special pig. About 2 years ago, my little boy was out on the pond when it was frozen and the ice cracked and he fell in and that pig dived right in and grabbed the boy by the collar, pulled him out and saved his life." And the man said, "That is impressive." And the farmer said, "Well, that is not all. A couple years ago, a guy was breaking into our house at night. We were sleeping. The guy had a gun in his hand. The pig leaped on him and knocked him over. And the guy ran out the door and ran and the police caught him. That is a special pig."

Then he said, "Well, why does he have two wooden legs?" And the farmer said, "I am not quite through. I have got to tell you another story. Then our house caught on fire about 6 months ago. The pig ran in, pulled us out of bed, woke us up and saved the entire family. That is one special pig."

And the guy says to the farmer, "Well, I still do not understand. Why does it have two wooden legs?" And the farmer said, "Well, it is very simple. You don't slaughter a pig like that all at once. That is a special pig."

And that is what is happening to the middle class, day in day out. We pay for Bosnia. I said, "we." I am middle class. Middle class pays for Bosnia. Middle class pays for Desert Storm. Middle class pays for Medicare. Middle class pays for the Park Service. Middle class pays for Medicaid. I am saying good programs here, but it is paid for on the backs of the middle class. And yet year after year, the taxes are just creeping up and up and up.

Today, a two-income family with a household income of \$55,000 is paying \$22,000 in taxes on an average. Which means, the second income, that spouse is working strictly for the Government. They may be working for a dry cleaners, may be working for an insurance company or bank, but the reality is when you are paying \$22,000 in taxes on a \$55,000 income, the second income goes straight to Uncle Sam, you are working for the Government.

Mr. PARKER. If the gentleman would yield, let us go beyond that. Because we talk about family farms. We talk about businesses. But from a national perspective, let us look on this thing from the standpoint of just exactly how does it affect a lot of people.

A lot of people do not realize the difficulty they are going to have. There are different values in this country for a lot of different things. It is regional in nature for many things. We can take a house in Mississippi that we pay \$100,000 for and it would be a nice home. If we put it in New York, we put it in Washington, DC, that house is going to be half a million dollars.

Now people back home in Mississippi cannot fathom that. Conversely, people from Washington, DC, and New York that come down to Mississippi and see a house, they cannot fathom that it is only \$100,000. The point is this: Down in Mississippi, people may have a little land with that house. But in New York or in Washington, DC, or San Francisco or Chicago, they may not have that land. But that house is valued so greatly that what happens is that person who owns a home who may have paid \$40,000 for it 35, 40, 45 years ago, when they come to their time of death and their spouse is left with the bill on this thing, all of a sudden they find out, I did not know that I was going to have this terrible bill. I had no idea. What am I going to do? You are going to take the money that I was going to live the remainder of my life on. What am I going to do?

The IRS says, do not worry, we will take care of you. We are going to let you have a payment plan over the next 10 years, and you are going to pay the IRS every month. IRS are kind people. They are sweet as they can be. But what they will do is keep food out of your mouth, make you sell that house, move you someplace where you do not want to move, change your plans where are you going to spend the last years of your life in a place you do not want to be, simply because you did not know that the increase of cost on your home would put you in that situation.

Mr. PAXON. That is what I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER] just highlighted. It is absolutely fundamental to what we are trying to do in the Congress.

Our goal is to balance our Nation's budget. Like every family back at home has to do, like every small business has to do, this Government should do it. But we are going beyond that. We are finding other ways to save money so we can allow families back at home to keep more of theirs.

As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] points out, that dollars go to the government because of taxes. Study after study has indicated that about 50 percent of household income in this country ends up in the pocket of the government at some level, about 38 percent in Federal and State local taxes.

I come from New York where that number is even higher. And then you add in the indirect cost of everybody and the goods and services we buy. That means, as the gentleman points out, one income earner in every family has got to be working to provide the government with the dollars. That is just fundamentally wrong. It removes the choice from the families, maybe parents stay home with the child or the vacation they want to take or something else they want to do to enhance the quality of life with their children.

No. 2, we just keep putting these burdens on and putting them on without any rational reason because of the money we are wasting here in Washington. We undermine the people's faith in government. I think it is time, whether it is in the form of that \$500-per-child tax credit, whether it is rolling back the tax on investment and saving, some people call it capital gains. That is a tax on investment and savings, and also the death taxes.

Mr. PARKER. If the gentleman would yield, this is an interesting thing, because I always hear the liberals talk about the capital gains as being a tax break for the wealthy, and I have always been fascinated by that.

I turn around and look at somebody and they have worked hard all their life, they consider themselves middle class, and they bought a house in the 1950's and they are coming up close to retirement and they bought a house for \$25,000, and they turn around and that house has increased in value over the last 40 years a considerable amount. And let us say that house is now \$100,000, they have an increase of \$75,000.

The question is this: When you get that check for \$100,000, which that took care of the \$25,000 original investment and the \$75,000 increase, do you think the Federal Government is owed basically one-third of that amount? Do they need to get a check for between \$20,000 and \$25,000? Do they deserve that? Is it their money?

My position is, it is not the Federal Government's money; it never was

their money; it should not be their money; and this tax should be changed. Whether it is on capital gains or estate tax, it is all the same principle. We are talking about private property rights here.

Mr. KINGSTON. If both the gentlemen would yield, let me just ask both of my colleagues, quiz time: What do these countries have in common? Australia, Canada, Egypt, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Israel, Kuwait, New Zealand, Switzerland, Uruguay? What do they have in common?

Mr. PARKER. I would hope they have no capital gains.

Mr. KINGSTON. No death taxes.

Mr. PAXON. Well, they are way ahead of us.

Mr. KINGSTON. The gentleman from Erie County [Mr. PAXON], where my dad is from, knows well that there are a whole lot of his friends who are probably now working and living in Canada, a lot of people he went to high school with.

□ 1630

I went to school at Michigan State. A whole bunch of folks, brothers ended up over there for other reasons. But the reality is for people to move from border States in America to avoid taxes is a great one.

Mr. PAXON. Let me just say to the gentleman, I live in a community that has been devastated economically over the years by the flight of jobs outside the country, moving outside of New York State and one reason, we for 20 years in New York until Governor Pataki came along had a policy in New York, tax everything the highest in the country. In addition to the Federal death taxes, the State death taxes are such that today when you pass away in New York State, you can almost be assured of the fact that your business is going to be dissipated. What that has meant is those jobs are gone. We go right back to what we started with. Families are harmed. It is the family that ends up getting hurt. I am tired of the politicians in Washington talking about class warfare, helping the rich, hurting the poor and all this about the rich. Who ends up getting hurt the most? It ends up being Joe and Mary 6-Pack out on Main Street trying to earn a living, working in a small business and when that business is dissipated, their jobs are gone. When they try to sell their house and the Government takes their money, that means their kids may not have an education or they may not be able to retire someday, or some politicians in Washington say, "We don't want to give them that \$500 per child tax credit because it doesn't mean anything," they forget that to Joe and Mary back home it may mean the difference in that kid getting a better education or putting food on the table.

It is time we remember it is our constituents' money, it is not ours, it is not the IRS's or the Government's.

Mr. PARKER. Let me point out something. We are talking about a pri-

vate property issue. Private property rights is I think the cornerstone of our Nation. It is fundamental.

I like liberals. I always have. I think liberals are very important, because they have done some important things for our Nation. They have brought to light certain things that we needed brought to light. But a lot of times their solutions, I do not care for. I think that liberals have a right to believe the way they want to believe. This is America. But one problem that I have, and we disagree strongly with this, there are a lot of liberals in this country who believe that all property belongs to the people collectively. There is no such thing as private property rights. When we look at things like capital gains but more importantly when we look at things like death taxes, it really brings it to the fore. People have to understand that the Federal Government does not own this property. They act as though they do. We as individual citizens have paid for this property. We have paid for this business out of the blood and sweat of our own bodies. The Government has done nothing except try to inhibit us. Because of that, the Government has no right to come in and say, "We want part of that." I believe there should be absolutely no death tax. One of the purposes of this special order today, and there are going to be many more of these, is because this point is coming home to people finally. People are finally understanding that we must be in a position where we change the direction of this country. We do that by changing the fundamental tax structure. We are going to be talking about different items concerning the death tax and how it affects people and the changes that need to occur so that the American people will understand exactly what is going to happen to them. Many of them are not aware.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield, I want to make a point. I am sorry the gentleman from New York [Mr. PAXON] left because he has this 1-year-old baby. I am sure that he and the gentlewoman from New York [Ms. MOLINARI] will be fortunate enough to have other children and before they know it, they are going to be doing what we do in the Kingston household nearly every weekend, and, that is, we go down to the sports complex and watch one of our four children playing baseball, tee ball, or soccer. My wife Libby is the soccer mom. That is what we do. We drive station wagons, we have got two girls and two boys, and they are playing sports. Out there on the soccer field are tons and tons of other soccer moms. These are people who work real hard and they kind of cram all their recreation into a 48-hour period called the weekend. But during the week they are working hard, paying taxes, trying to raise their children right, working two jobs, doing homework, doing laundry, organizing school, PTA-type activities, volunteering at the hospital or the United Way and so

forth. These are the people that this tax system is kicking in the face.

Money Magazine this month has a great article on the profile of the millionaire. It says, if you think millionaires are the people who are living in these huge houses with brand new cars and beach or mountain houses or whatever, you are wrong. Most of those folks are simply in debt and in debt in a very, very big way. The typical millionaire, according to the Money Magazine survey, and it was a national survey, are the people who have worked in the same job 20 to 30 years, many school teachers, for example, they are people who own their own business, but not big, expensive businesses, dry cleaners, scrap metal, whatever, just what you would assume is maybe a modest business, if you will. They are folks who live under their means. They do not buy the house that they can afford, according to their real estate agent, they buy the house they feel comfortable with so they can pay it off. They work 60 hours a week, they work 50 hours a week, they save 15 percent of their income, they tend to stay married, they tend to not go on fancy vacations. They really have what we would call in psychology a dull, normal lifestyle. They are just regular folks. Yet those are the people who are paying for the whole \$4.5 trillion budget that we have in Washington.

Mr. PARKER. We have got a lot of people around this country when I am talking to them about death taxes, they sit back and go, "That doesn't affect me." But whenever I start asking them, I say, "Didn't you inherit a little bit of land from your daddy and mama?"

"Well, yeah, I've got 150 acres."

"Do you know what the current value is?"

They think in terms of what the value was when they inherited it. But inflation has changed that over a period of time. It shocks a lot of people out there to realize that the IRS comes in and values their property much more than they think their property is worth. They are looking at it from a realistic standpoint. The IRS looks at it from a fair market value and what other property has sold in the region. They have all these criteria.

What happens is all of a sudden these people who turn around and say, "Hey, I'm not rich, I don't have that much," they find out whenever the time comes that they had more than they thought. All of a sudden the Federal Government is going to come in and say, "By the way, we're going to take part of that." That is when it hits home. That is when all of a sudden people are in a situation that they say, "Hey, I had no idea that I was going to be affected."

Let me point out, we spend in this body all kind of time talking about investment and savings. We need more investment and savings. I must tell the gentleman, if we reward investment and savings, we are going to get more of it. If we penalize it, we are going to get less of it.

It is no wonder that we have a lot of people in this country who do not worry about investment and savings because some of them realize that whenever their time comes, after they have spent a lifetime working, that the Federal Government is going to come in and confiscate it. If that occurs, all of a sudden all they have worked for all of these years is null and void.

We as a Nation have got to change that. We as a Congress have got to realize that the people in this country are pretty much fed up, they are sick and tired of being sick and tired and they are ready to make some changes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Going back again to the middle class soccer moms and dads, one of the taxes that we Republicans are pushing is a \$500 per child tax credit. In sophisticated boardrooms, folks do not want that. That is the least popular. However, that is the one that is going to benefit the most people. I support it for that reason.

Number two, because it is the biggest cut in the size of the Federal Government. The less money middle class folks send to Washington, the less influence Uncle Sam is going to have on their lives and the less the bureaucracy in Washington is going to be able to grow.

What is ironic is that the President of the United States now, instead of giving a \$500 per child tax credit to working, let me repeat that, working middle-class taxpayers, he wants to make it a welfare payment to people who are not working enough to pay taxes. In other words, we have got the Jones family over here who is busting their tails working 50 or 60 hours a week, mom, 50, 60 hours a week, dad, and they are in line for a \$500 per child tax credit, and we have got some other folks who are working through public assistance type programs but they are not paying taxes. The President wants to give them both a \$500 per child tax credit, but the difference is this group right here, they are paying taxes, and the other group is not paying taxes, so it is just a gift to them. It is an expansion of welfare even though the welfare rolls are decreasing.

I know we are talking death taxes, but again it goes back to the overtaxation of working, middle-class Americans. The harder you have to work, the less time you have at home. The less time you have at home, the less time you have to impart information and values to your children.

One thing I have learned about children, I guess two things. Number one, it is the hardest thing in the world to try to get them on the right path. I do not know what I am doing wrong. If anybody has suggestions, let me know. I try my best. Anybody who has been a parent knows the feeling.

Number two, you have got to spend lots of time with kids trying to teach them right from wrong, trying to teach them the work ethic. It is not any fun doing homework, it is not any fun memorizing multiplication tables, it is

not any fun waking up 7 days a week and making your bed and picking up laundry, but I know this, that it is all tied into the big picture. As a father and Libby as their mother, if we do our part, then they will grow up one day to be independent, independent of government programs and government dependency. They will be taxpayers.

Mr. PARKER. That independence that the gentleman is talking about basically is getting the government out of somebody's pocketbook and out of their lives.

I must tell the gentleman, some of this stuff is pretty simple to me. One of the reasons I support the death penalty is because I know for a fact that whenever that murderer is put to death, he will commit no more crimes. No more crimes will be committed by that individual. I support that.

I also support certain things that other people look at a little odd, I think. I listened around here to Democrats, and Republicans, talk about shutting down the Federal Government. Democrats were tickled to death that the Republicans were blamed with the shutdown. The Republicans were all worried that they were getting blamed with the shutdown. My personal view is a little bit differently. I do not think the American people were that upset with the government shutting down. I think they were more upset that we opened it back up.

My personal view is they would have liked to have seen the government shut down, and I wanted to see it shut down for longer than it was, simply because the American people after a few months would realize they do not need a lot of the things that the Federal Government says that we have to have in order to survive.

I think that makes a tremendous amount of sense. Why do we have all these programs? Why do we have programs that are not working? Why do we add new programs without getting rid of the old programs? Why do we have over 700 programs in the Department of Education? When the President says that a lot of those programs are not working, instead of getting rid of a lot of the programs that are there, he just adds more on to it.

I think it is fascinating, and the American people are getting fed up with this. They are finally seeing that things need to be changed. One thing I like about the family tax credit is it gets the government, maybe just \$500-per-child, but it gets that \$500 away from the government and gives it back to the family.

Mr. KINGSTON. Per family, that is not going to make or break you necessarily. You are going to be able to buy some more stuff with it and it is going to be good, but it is going to help 11 million kids.

Let me give the gentleman some fun facts on taxes. The Tax Code itself is 5.6 million words. It is 7 times longer than the Bible, according to the Heritage Foundation. Americans spent last

year about \$225 billion to comply with the Tax Code, and they devoted 5.4 billion hours to comply with it.

□ 1645

And the Tax Foundation estimates that the median two-earner family paid 39.4 percent of its income in taxes last year, which had increased from 38.1 percent in 1995. And in 1955 the median two-income family just paid 27.7 percent of income taxes. That is 10.7 percent less than what that same family paid in 1996.

Those are real numbers, and I will be happy to share those with anybody who wants.

Mr. PARKER. I thank the gentleman. I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER].

Mr. BOEHNER. Well, I like to thank my colleague for yielding and certainly want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. PARKER] and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. KINGSTON] and others who have been to the floor this afternoon talking about the issue of taxes.

As the gentleman from Georgia just pointed out, the American people are paying more in taxes to all levels of government than at any time in the history of our country, and when we look at the middle class and the fact that wages are not growing as fast as we like, all we have to do is to begin to look at why this crunch is occurring to American families, and it is as a result of taxes, higher taxes at the Federal level, State level, local level that are continuing to take more of their hard earned paychecks.

I am proud of the fact that for the first time in 16 years this Congress is going to pass a plan that will cut taxes for middle-income Americans.

We are hearing an awful lot of demagoguery and noise coming from the White House and others that this plan only helps the rich, and it is just not true. Nine-three percent of the taxes that will be reduced in this plan are for people who make under \$100,000 a year. Nine-three percent of the tax package goes to those people. As a matter of fact, 72 percent of the tax package goes to families that make between \$20,000 a year and \$70,000 a year.

So if you look at this package in terms of the focus and where the savings are going, they are going to American families who pay the bulk of our taxes.

Yes, the wealthy pay their share of taxes in America. But when you look at the numbers of people in America, most people find themselves in the middle class, and they are the ones that pay the big bulk of the taxes to this Government.

And I just want to come down to say I congratulate Mr. PARKER and Mr. KINGSTON and those that have been here before for standing here on the floor today and outlining to the American people just how important this tax package is.

Mr. PARKER. I thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOEHNER]. We do not

have but just a few minutes left, and I want to personally thank everyone that has been involved in the special order.

We are going to have special orders on this issue over the next few months, weeks and months, to familiarize the people of this country with what is going on. Now I realize that it is very true that you can save a lot of money to pay the taxes, or you can have insurance, or you can do different types of financial planning. But I want people to consider this one thing:

When you are preparing for death taxes, the average family business or farm spends nearly \$20,000 in legal fees, \$11,900 for accounting fees and \$11,200 for other advisers. The typical small business owner normally makes around \$40,000 a year.

Now I have got one question. Who among us who makes \$40,000 a year can afford to meet the staggering burden of a death tax?

Now to me the clear solution is this: We should eliminate the death tax. It is an unfair tax. It is a tax that puts burdens on people when they do not need any more burden. It also creates an environment where people no longer want to save, they no longer want to work, there is no reason for them to, and we are not giving them an incentive. And we create an environment that hurts our economy, and hurts our small businesses and small farms all around this Nation.

People need to realize the effect it is going to have, and I am looking forward to the liberals in this body coming to the floor, justifying the death tax. I want to see them stand and tell the American people and our colleagues why we should confiscate property, why we should confiscate money from individuals when they die, and spread it around and hurt people for doing what we ask people to do every day, and that is to work hard, to save, to take care of their families, to create jobs, to build their business, to make life better for their fellow man and their community. I want to see people come and defend that, the whole idea of death taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I think when that occurs, we will see the American people understand what position and what side they should be on, and I am looking forward to this debate over and over again until we get total repeal of the death tax.

THE CLEAN AIR ACT AND THE CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS HAVE BEEN A GREAT SUCCESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KLINK] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, as with the previous gentleman speaking, when the Government takes action or the Government takes inaction, it has an impact on all of our lives. Sometimes

that impact that the Government has on our lives can be positive, and other times it can be negative.

I would agree with many Republicans and Democrats, with many liberals and conservatives, with many in industry and in labor and in the environmental movement that one of the positive things that the government has done is to provide us with clean air. The Clean Air Act and Clean Air Act amendments have been a great success.

Coming from my region of western Pennsylvania where we had unbelievably dirty air because of the heavy industry and the steel mills, and you go back 30, 40, 50 years ago, our region was once described as hell with the lid off. In midday the sun would be blackened out by the soot that would be coming out of smokestacks that would not allow the sunshine to get down to the people on the earth, and people had tremendous problems breathing. In Donora, PA, people were actually dropping dead in the street many decades ago as they were the victims of a temperature inversion and all of the poisons that were spewed into the air.

We have gotten beyond that, and in fact, I would invite, Mr. Speaker, you or any of my colleagues to come to Pittsburgh, PA, today. It is a beautiful city, it is a clean city. The air is clean, the water is clean, and in all of our three rivers, which we are so famous for, you can now catch fish. But where there were once mill sites there is now level land. Where there were once tens of thousands of manufacturing jobs, there is now in many instances desperation and poverty. We are coming back in many areas; many areas, we are still going down.

That is why I am here today, because I fear that my Federal Government, that Federal Government that I am a part of as an elected Representative of Congress, is about to make a very severe error. I am afraid that we are about to reverse what has been a steady increase toward cleaner air, and in what is a veiled attempt, I think, to try to tighten clean air regulations, my fear is that the EPA and anyone else who goes along with them will, in fact, allow the air to remain dirty longer.

You see, we have definitive dates in place now whereby that soot; it is called particulate matter in scientific language, but all of that smoke stack soot that is going through the air, we are supposed to be reaching certain goals, and have that air cleaned, and we have been doing that. And that ozone, which is technical talk for smog, we have areas including here in Washington, DC, and Baltimore, specific periods in time at which we are to reach the goals and specific goals have been set.

Well, here comes a lawsuit by the American Lung Association, and they are rightfully, I think, pointed out to the EPA that since we last took a look at particulate matter or smog back in 1987, many more than 5 years has

passed, and according to the statute every 5 years the EPA is supposed to take a look at these issues.

And so it was that they went to court and they said to EPA you have to go back and you have to reexamine what you are doing with particulate matter. It does not mean they have to tighten the standards, it does not mean that they have to change the standards. It simply means they have to go back and review those standards.

And so, Mr. Speaker, they have, and they formed a scientific advisory group that has made some recommendations, and we, in the Committee on Commerce, two of our subcommittees, the oversight and investigation subcommittee of which I am the ranking Democrat and the health and environment subcommittee, held a series of hearings, and we heard from some of the scientists, and we heard from other interested people, and we heard from Carol Browner, the administrator of EPA. Over an 8-hour hearing we heard from Miss Browner. My concern is that it appears EPA is moving forward not to just review particulate matter, as they have been told to do, but they have also coupled this with changing the ozone standards. They were not supposed to do that. They were not told to do that. So when dealing with soot, with that particulate matter that we ingest into our lungs which could cause physical problems, that is complex enough. Why are we deciding to tackle two very difficult issues at the same time?

Well, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that after all of the hearings that we have had and after all of the questions that have been asked we still do not know. We have never gotten a straight answer. My fear is it is because that EPA understands that while there may be a stronger case for dealing with that soot that is in the air, there is a much weaker case for dealing with ozone. So they couple the two. They can head in the direction that they feel we need to head.

But what would be the ramifications of that? You might say, well, if we tighten the standards, we are all going to breathe healthier air. But the fact of the matter is that simply is not true, and that is why I have taken to the floor today. That is why many of my colleagues on both the Republican side and the Democratic side have been talking about this issue. That is why mayors and Governors and State legislators and local government officials and labor unions have begun to talk about this, because we fear that by changing the finish line in the middle of the race the race will never be finished. No matter what happens, and Carol Browner, the Administrator of the EPA, told us in the hearings, she has told others, environmentalists agree, I agree, my Republican colleagues agree that if we do nothing, we are still going to continue to clean the air. The air will get cleaner. We all want cleaner air.

But when we tighten those standards, the States that have not implemented their air cleaning plans are going to stop and say wait a minute, you cannot give us a different target. That target that we were working toward right now has been moved.

And so now Federal Government, we have to go back to our industries. We in the States who must reach attainment for our air quality have to go back to our industries, we have to go back to our local government leaders, and we have to figure out how do we get back into attainment for a new standard while we were just beginning to clean the air and make it healthier for children, for elderly, for all of our citizens.

This will cause confusion among industries, industries that have spent tens upon tens of millions of dollars to install scrubbers to install the latest technology so that they have cleaned that air in Pittsburgh, and in Detroit, and in Cleveland, OH, and in New York City, and in Philadelphia, PA, and in my area in Beaver County, and Westmoreland County, in Lawrence County, PA. They have spent all of that money to clean the air, we have seen the dramatic results, and now the EPA is about ready to say, no; we had you driving toward the wrong standard. It is time that we tighten that standard.

Well, needless to say many of these industries are going to certainly say we are finished investing. Until we know what the rules of the game are, until the Federal Government can ensure us that we are working toward something that we know is going to be good science, that we know is going to be a final destination where we will in fact, have agreement, we are not going to do anything. And I have had industries that have told me they are not going to expand any more. I have had other industries that said we are not going to move into western Pennsylvania because we are afraid to make that investment.

Mr. Speaker, why in the world are we going to spend tens of millions of dollars or hundreds of millions of dollars building a manufacturing facility and then have the Federal Government say the rules have changed? With NAFTA we can now build that facility in Mexico, and we can ship all those products right into the United States, have access to the market with no tariffs, or we can build that facility in Canada, and we do not have to deal with a Jeckyll and Hyde EPA that changes their mind as to what the specific rules of the game are going to be.

□ 1700

This is important to me, because as we cleaned the air during the 1960's and 1970's and 1980's, and I admit, we needed to clean the air, people were dying. We had people with severe respiratory problems. But as we cleaned the air there was a price to pay, not only for installing the scrubbers in the smokestacks, there was a price to pay for jobs.

Take a look at the employment in areas like southwestern Pennsylvania prior to the Clean Air Act. Take a look at how many steel mills were operating, and as we spent money to clean up the air, that was money that we did not spend on capital improvements in those manufacturing facilities.

Now, there are many people on the other side of this argument who will argue to me, oh, the EPA has done studies, and their studies have shown that in fact not a single job was lost due to clean air. Well, that is like me asking the fox if the rooster and the hen both died of natural causes. The fox is going to say, oh, yes, they both had heart attacks, and I ate them because, well, they just happened to be dead.

We cannot trust the EPA in this matter. They have a bad credibility problem when it comes to southwestern Pennsylvania. Because you see, they leaned on the State of Pennsylvania just a few years ago to tell us that what we really needed to do to meet our clean air standards, and that is not the new standards that we feel they are going to propose, this is the old standards, the ones that we are moving toward, and they told us that in order to hit that, we had to have a centralized emissions testing program for our automobiles and our trucks.

Well, the State of Pennsylvania, under Governor Casey, decided at that time to go out and sign a contract with a company from Arizona called EnviroTest. So we built 86, they were called E test systems where people in many counties across Pennsylvania, we have 67 counties, and many of our counties were going to have to go to the centralized testing facility. There were only a handful of them in each county, maybe one or two or at most four in each county, so it was going to create a problem. They could no longer go to their neighborhood mechanic who could buy a piece of equipment to test the automobiles; they had to go to a specialized central test.

Now, if there was a line, people may have to sit in that line for hours. That means lost work, lost time, and obviously the people of Pennsylvania were not real thrilled about this. So we went to war with the EPA and they said, you really do not have to do this. The problem was, by the time they give us this "whoops, you really do not have to do what the Federal Government was forcing you to do," we already had a contract signed with EnviroTest. We had built 86 E test systems.

EnviroTest was planning on making as much as \$100 million a year in profits out of Pennsylvania. So obviously, they were not going to take this lying down; they were going to file a suit against the State of Pennsylvania because Pennsylvania had done what they felt EPA was forcing them to do.

In the meantime, we got a new governor, Tom Ridge, who was our colleague here in the House. Governor Ridge saw this as a real problem, and

so he sat down with EnviroTest and said, we will reach an out-of-court settlement with you. That out-of-court settlement was \$145 million because EPA gave us that big "whoops."

Now, that is \$145 million, Mr. Speaker, that we are not spending in Pennsylvania to build new highways. It is \$145 million that we are not spending for Medicaid, or to educate our children, or for any of the many other things that the taxpayers that I represent in Pennsylvania would like us to spend that money for. It went to pay off an agreement that we had with an out-of-State firm to do centralized testing because we thought the Environmental Protection Agency was forcing us into that position.

Not one penny of that \$145 million, Mr. Speaker, cleaned up the air. The air did not get any cleaner at all. In fact, I would think the air got dirtier because all of the hot air that we heard from the Federal Government demanding that the State of Pennsylvania do this. Other States have been in a similar position.

The question is, why in the world would we now, while we are cleaning the air, change the target? Why would we force industry that has made investments in cleaning the air, that is moving toward providing more employment, all of a sudden force them to step back and say, I am not sure I want to make an investment in an area like southwestern Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, in our region while we were cleaning up the air we lost 155,000 manufacturing jobs. That is just one section of the State of Pennsylvania. Those are not my numbers, Mr. Speaker. Those numbers come from a white paper done by Carnegie-Mellon University who years later went back and took a look at the impact of the industrial downsizing in the Pittsburgh region.

So when we had a chance several months ago to have a new automobile plant move into western Pennsylvania, we were excited. It was a 1,000-acre site, 2,500 jobs, very good-paying jobs in auto manufacturing, but when the company took a look at the fact that Pennsylvania is located in something called the Northeast Ozone Transport Region, meaning that all of the smog from the West moves toward Pennsylvania and the States from Maine down through Pennsylvania to Northern Virginia are in this ozone transport region, and the rules are different for us because we are in that region, they said, well, we are not going to deal there.

We are not going to build a facility there, because first of all, it would cost us a minimum of \$3 million to buy pollution credits. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not just the fact that one cannot pollute, it is the fact that if one is wealthy enough and if one is prone to want to invest, one can actually buy pollution credits. So one can still pollute if one wants to, if one can find those credits.

Now, here is what happens with the pollution credits. Generally a larger firm would have the money to purchase those credits from a smaller firm. The smaller firm then would go out and find some greenfield site located somewhere else, they would build their facility and they would begin polluting there. So we do need to take a look at what kind of particulate matter, what kind of soot, is causing adverse health affects. We have done many studies on smog, so I think that the science on smog is in.

The problem with what they are doing on smog or ozone is that they want to go from .12 parts per million studied over a 1-hour period to .08 parts per million over an 8-hour period. Now, this group of scientists that was studying this, I do not want to get too complex, but I want to explain to people that this group of scientists said, look, you can do anything from .508 to .08 to .09. They chose the number in the middle. Here is the important point about that.

Had they chosen the higher range the scientists recommended, 400 additional counties across this Nation would not be in noncompliance.

Now, what does that mean, 400 counties in noncompliance? That means if you are located in those counties, immediately when EPA files these new standards, you have to buy the most sophisticated technology for anything that you do. It means that your building permit process becomes much stricter and much tougher, and quite frankly, in those counties you are probably not going to see much industrial expansion and you are going to see almost no new construction, because why would an industry want to move into a county that is already in noncompliance? So there is a stigma that occurs with noncompliance.

Now, in a rush to get Members on both sides of the aisle to not believe that this was the case, EPA Administrator Browner, we believe, has been making some assurances to Members of Congress and to officials at the State, county and local level, that they are really going to kind of look the other way as far as enforcement goes.

Now, the fact of the matter is, whether they look the other way or not, the day those regulations are in the books, things change, because as Ms. Browner testified before our committee, it is up to the States and the local government to come into compliance with the standards set by the Federal Government. If they do not do it, then the Federal Government comes in and can then insist that they do it one way or another. If they have been out of compliance, they have not taken steps, the Federal Government would at that point step in.

We understand one Member of Congress from northeastern Ohio was assured that an automobile manufacturing plant and an automobile casting plant in his district would not have to put on additional controls, even if

those plants were located in counties that were found to be in noncompliance based on the new standards.

My question to EPA is how do you do that? How do you say, these are the regulations, but a wink and a nod, you do not have to listen to them? And if that is the case, well, Ms. Browner is the administrator, what happens if she is no longer the administrator? Does EPA do something different? Is this an assurance only for this Member of Congress that is receiving that assurance?

So the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL] and myself have written to Administrator Browner, and we have asked how they can make these assurances. We also would applaud what appears to be recognition by EPA that there are problems these proposals will create for industry and for local governments, and for State governments. So we also would like them to talk to us about how those problems are going to be dealt with.

The assertions that the administrator seems to be making to these Members of Congress and to other elected officials have raised really three fundamental questions. Number one, who is receiving these assurances? Are only certain Members of Congress being told that their industries will get a bye on this, or will all of our districts get a bye on obeying these new regulations? And what were those assurances? Exactly, specifically, what are you assuring us that EPA will do or will not do?

Number three, how much value would those assurances have, given the fact in the face of contradictory statutory provisions and the expansion of citizens' rights found in the Clean Air Act? Because any citizen has the ability, under the Clean Air Act, to bring a suit and say, you are not adhering to this act. So once the EPA said, forget about these standards that were working, forget about these standards that we were reaching, that the States were developing State implementation plans to achieve that were causing the air to get cleaner, forget about those, we now have new standards.

The citizen says, wait a second, you are not doing what you should be doing in these areas. That citizen can bring a suit, and we need to know what impact a possible citizen suit would have. I do not think that the assurances that the administrator is giving is worth the breath with which they are uttered, and if they are written on paper, I would like to see the paper, and I do not think that they are worth the paper that they are being written on.

I think, Mr. Speaker, you are aware and most of my colleagues are aware that title I of the Clean Air Act amendments sets out the steps that the EPA and the States have to take once we have a new ambient air quality standard that is established pursuant to section 107. The EPA is then to promulgate area designations based on the new standards, and they are supposed to do it directly from the act. The

quote is, "as expeditiously as practicable, but in no case later than two years from the date of promulgation of the new or revised national ambient air quality standards."

So how can they say to my friend from Ohio, or any other Member of Congress or to anyone else, do not worry about the new standards, you are all right, trust us. We are the Federal Government. We are here to help you.

I also have questions. Within three years after the promulgation of the national air ambient standards, the States have to submit an implementation plan which has to include numerous planning and control requirements, as well as an enforceable schedule, the timetable that the sources within that region that is out of compliance that is going to comply, and we want to know, given all of this, how can we give assurances to anyone that these timetables will not be adhered to?

Now, let me go from the general discussion for a moment just to talk about smog, or ozone, as it is known. Here in the Washington, D.C. area, and in Baltimore, I mentioned a little bit earlier that by 1999, I think it is, they have to reach their standards. Here is where this actually ends up, I believe, making the air dirtier longer. As soon as we have new standards going from the .12 for 1 hour to .08 for 8 hours, these regions can say, wait a minute, time out.

□ 1715

You have just changed the end zone. As a result of that, here is what I am going to do. I need my 10 or 12 years additional time to meet the new timetables. So they can stop all the things they are doing to implement clean air standards.

If you have a child who is 8 or 9 years old who has asthma and you are concerned, and you say, boy, this is a good thing, we are only 2 years, this is 1997, in 2 years in the Washington, D.C.-Baltimore area they are going to take action. They are going to have the air cleaned as regards to smog to this standard.

All of a sudden, EPA comes in, changes the standard, and the local people and the State people and the District people say, wait a second, we want our 10 or 12 years. So now that child will be 20 years old, will in fact be in college and perhaps move out of the area or be employed before the new standard has to be reached. So you are not protecting that child, who is now 8 or 9 or 10 years old. We are putting it off for another decade or more.

I do not believe we should be doing that. We have worked so hard to clean up the air. We have given up so much for the sake of clean air. To now change the final stopping place in the middle of the race, as we are so close to reaching those standards, does not make any sense.

The other problem with this is that there is a problem with transport. We have this in Pennsylvania. Our friends

to the west of us, States like Ohio and Michigan and Indiana and Illinois and Minnesota and on and on, send us their dirty air. We in turn send our dirty air to Delaware and New York and New Jersey. It is called transport. It is a problem we all have.

There is a group now that is called OTAG, a group which is a task force that is supposed to study this problem of transport of smog, how do we deal with it. They are, as we are speaking now, supposed to file their final report.

These new regulations do not make it—there are no new tools to deal with the problem of the air that is transported into our regions. Yet, it is going to stop this OTAG process, their ability to issue final recommendations, which in fact could cause the air to get cleaner because we would deal with the transport of pollution from one State to another.

There is a reluctance of States to take action against each other. As I mentioned, my State of Pennsylvania would be reluctant to seek action against States to our west because we do not want the States to our east to come after us, so there is kind of a Mexican standoff that is taking place. We are all looking forward to the day when we can sit down through this OTAG report and say, this is how we are going to deal with the transport problem.

I am particularly interested because my district happens to be right on the border with West Virginia and Ohio. So a business could locate in those States and not have the same stringent ozone requirements they would have in my district, because we are in that area designated the northeast ozone regional transport region. So we are getting that dirty air in from our west, we have the Allegheny mountains that act as a backstop, and we are done.

In fact, if we were to evacuate southwestern Pennsylvania, take out all of the industry, take all of the people out of their homes, take all of the vehicles out of southwestern Pennsylvania, shut it down, give it back to the birds and the wildlife, under the new proposed standards there would be several days a year that we would still be in excess of the standard allowed for smog.

We cannot meet the new standard. It is impossible until we deal with the transport issue of that dirty air that our friends and neighbors to the west are sending us. I think that Pennsylvania is not the only region that is having this problem. There are many other areas across the country that are having a problem with transport.

Let me just mention that I am not asking Members to believe me just because I happen to be a Member of Congress, or because I happen to sit in on some of these hearings. I think that the scientists and the scientific evidence would point out that what I am saying is correct.

The CASAC group that gave the recommendations to EPA is chaired currently by Dr. Joe Mauderly. He has

been the Chair this year and on into the future, we hope. When talking about the issue of the ozone or smog, he said: "While I support the proposed change as logical from a scientific viewpoint, I would point out that it should also be considered that an equal or greater overall health benefit might be derived by using the Nation's resources to achieve compliance with the present standard in presently non-compliant regions, than by enforcing nationwide compliance with a more restrictive standard."

What is he saying? The same thing I have been saying for the last half an hour. That is, we are better to try to meet the current standard, a standard that is allowing us to clean up the air, a standard that local government has been working toward, State government has been working toward, industry has been investing money to work toward, rather than changing the target. If we use our resources in that manner, to bring the areas that are still out of compliance into compliance, we will have more healthier kids, we will have a healthier industry.

He also says, and my friends out in the west, Mr. Speaker, I would hope would listen to this, this is Joe Mauderly, this is not the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RON KLINK], this is someone who has knowledge of these matters because he has studied it and looked at it, and he is designated as the chairman of this group that is supposed to be advising EPA.

He says: "I am concerned that New Mexico and other arid regions with alkaline soils, the substantial portion of soil-derived PM that can exist as PM_{2.5}," and we call it soot but it also could be agricultural dust, so you understand, if you have alkaline type soils, that that loose soil blowing in the wind from agricultural activities could cause the new PM_{2.5}, 2.5 microns, to be out there in the air.

Now we have a problem. What is this? What we are talking about with particulate matter, or as I said, it is that soot, we refer to it in the northeast as coming out of an industrial site, but obviously it can come out of an airplane exhaust, it can come out of a power plant smoke stack. Particulate matters are the dusts and soils that are blowing in the air, so it can come from different things. What they are talking about doing is going from PM₁₀, 10 microns, to PM_{2.5}. It is smaller. They are saying it is smaller, so when it is ingested into the lungs it is more dangerous, harder to get out.

The question is, is all 2.5 microns the same? Meaning if it is of a certain size, is there not a different toxicity to it? Are some things not more toxic than others? Are they more dense than others? How about when you use different kinds of particulate matter in conjunction with each other? We do not know all the answers to this, because in this whole Nation there are only 50 monitors that measure particulate matter in the 2.5 micron range. We do not have the data. We do not know.

How long will it take to get the data? Mr. Speaker, it is going to take at least 2 years to manufacture and deploy enough particulate matter sensors so we can get that information. Then, according to the law, and we are here about the law, you have to monitor that data for at least 3 years. That is 2 years to manufacture and get them deployed, 3 years to study, on a minimum.

At the end of that, that is 5 years, it is time for the EPA to reanalyze particulate matter. So why are we going to spend billions of dollars going to a new, more stringent standard that industry will not be able to comply with, that State and local facilities and governments will not be able to comply with, only to know that by the time we actually have that data 5 years down the road there will be another lawsuit forcing EPA to look at it again?

It does not make any sense, Mr. Speaker. It absolutely does not make any sense. We need to do the studies first. On this issue, Democrats and Republicans alike agree. We are willing in this House to fund the studies. It is better for us to spend tens of millions of dollars making sure that we are headed toward good science and a good health impact for our citizens, rather than spending billions of dollars, only to find out that again, EPA has gone "whoops," 5 years from now, and told us that back in 1997 we made a bad decision.

Remember, they did that in Pennsylvania with centralized emissions testing. Do not make the same mistake in all 50 States, shutting down industries, stopping industrial growth, cutting down on the number of jobs, meaning the number of people who have paychecks and the number of people who have medical benefits at their jobs. There is an adverse health effect to not moving forward and having industry grow in this country.

Why am I here on the floor today? It is because when we had the loss of 155,000 manufacturing jobs, and I was at that time a journalist who was documenting it, I am not willing to stand here in the halls of Congress and watch the Federal Government make the same mistake that will cost people their jobs, cost them the quality of their lives, and then have the EPA and someone else years from now say, whoops, it was a mistake.

Show me that it is good science. Justify to me and the rest of this Congress that this is a good decision. Make sure that we are headed in the right direction, and you cannot do it with only 50 monitors in this country. You cannot force every industry to go to a new standard when they are already cleaning up the air, when State implementation plans are still being implemented, and you are putting the air quality of this country at risk.

About 40-some Members of Congress from our side of the aisle have tried for many weeks, Mr. Speaker, and I think many of our colleagues on the Republican side know this, we have tried to

sit down with the President. We want to talk to the administration about this before his EPA administrator makes what we think is going to be, we think she is going to do it, a bad decision to change the finish line in the middle of this race.

We have sent a letter. We have not even received back a note that said, we got your mail, we are thinking about it. That is bothersome. I want the President to sit down with us. Let us try to figure out how we can resolve this. Let us figure out how we, and those of us in Congress on both sides of the aisle, we want clean air. We want it to be a good decision. We want it to be a decision that is based on science that we are all comfortable with.

With the Clean Air Act, the Clean Air Act amendments, every major step that we have made toward cleaning up the environment, we have done it with a broad, bipartisan consensus. There is no broad, bipartisan consensus for implementing these new standards.

There is no reason why the EPA is doing smog at the same time they are doing soot, or particulate matter and ozone, if you want to be scientific. There is no reason they are doing both of those things together. I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that other Members who may be watching me talk back in their offices would step forward and would help us to get the attention of the administration, to try to stop what I think really would be bad policy, bad policy for this country.

Just in case the administration does not heed us, just in case we are too late, tomorrow, I would hope, we are prepared to introduce a piece of legislation, myself, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON], so it is a bipartisan bill. We hope many of our colleagues will join us.

The purpose of this bill is not to open the Clean Air Act. I want to make that straight to my friends. We think that is a Pandora's box. The Clean Air Act is working. We are happy with the progress we have made. That is why we are here. We like the progress. We like the progress we are still going to make.

We agree with Carol Browning, no matter what happens, the air is going to get cleaner. We do not want to stop that. But we do want to put a 5-year moratorium on the establishment of these new standards. Let us continue with industry, with the labor unions, with the support of local government and State governments, to move toward bringing those areas that are still out of compliance into compliance. Let us deal with the issue of transport, of pollution across State lines.

So we are going to ask for a 5-year moratorium on the establishment of new ozone and fine particulate matter standards under the Clean Air Act. We really think that this is the direction that we want to go. We believe that most of the programs under the Clean Air Act and the amendments of 1990 are continuing or have yet to be imple-

mented. We want to see them implemented. We want to see the results.

We believe that this country has made tremendous progress on reducing atmospheric levels of ozone and particulate matter since the passage of the amendments back in 1990. We think that that progress is going to continue.

□ 1730

And by changing the current national ambient air quality standards for ozone, which we just do not think makes a great deal of sense, we also think that really both the Environmental Protection Agency and this CASAC group, the scientists that I talked about, it stands for Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, both of them have recommended that additional research should be conducted to determine the additional health effects of these finer particles and that this should include taking a look at biological mechanisms, how bad and to what extent combining different kinds of particles has an adverse health effect.

Here is the EPA and here are these scientists, this Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, all saying we need further research but we think we are going to go to the new standards anyway. It does not make any sense.

So given that fact and the fact that there really is a lack of atmospheric data because we only have about 50 of these 2.5 monitors in this country, it makes sense to do the studies first. It makes sense to go out and measure across this Nation what kind of 2.5 particles do we have, at what level, at what density, what are the health impacts, and are we sure that if we clean them up to this level that there is going to be a health benefit from that.

You say, why would you say that? Would there not be a health benefit? We do not know.

Let me tell my colleagues what happened in London, England back in the 1950s, and it is happening in southwestern Pennsylvania and it is happening across this country now. In London back in 1950s, they had all this black soot in the air. They had problems with respiratory illnesses, bronchial infections. They cleaned the air up. The incidences of asthma increased. Why? They do not know. They still do not know.

That has happened in southwestern Pennsylvania and it is happening across this country. There are all kind of ideas, but the whole point is, why, when we clean up the air, is asthma increasing, not only in the number of cases, the percentage of people that are getting it, but also the violent aspect of it is also getting worse. What is going on here?

There are different ideas. We need time to find out what are the answers to those questions. Setting the new standard right now does not change anything except it stops the progress that we have been making. It stops the benefits that we have been seeing for quite some time.

We have watched the air slowly, slowly getting better, getting more clean. I can remember, and I will make an admission, Mr. Speaker, back in my early days in the television business, I was a television weather forecaster and in the Pittsburgh region, as a matter of fact. And we had to, back in the 1970s, every day, along with the temperature and the barometric pressure, the direction the winds were going, tell the people what days they could go outside and exercise and when they could not and when you kept your children in and when you keep the elderly people in. And we had to tell them what aspect of the air was bad, if it was particulate matter, if it was ozone, if it was whatever.

Still, when I get home, I watch my friends who are still doing the weather forecasting. They do not do that anymore. The air has gotten that much cleaner. But the other aspect of that is the air has gotten cleaner. As I drive into Pittsburgh on the parkway east, where once there was a giant steel mill, there is now a high tech center. We are happy to have those jobs, but the steel industry is not there anymore. When you go to the town of Aliquippa, where once there was a 7-mile-long steel mill, there is now a big flat spot along the Ohio River. So we have paid not only with our tax dollars, we have paid with corporate investments. We have paid with jobs.

Do not make us pay for something that we are unsure of what the benefit will be. Do not make us pay for something that may in fact be more detrimental to our health and at the same time cause this Nation's wealth to go into a downward spiral where companies will not be investing in these regions, where jobs will not be created in these regions. That is what I fear is going to happen.

We have heard from governors across this Nation who are in favor of the wait and see position that I have espoused here today. We have heard from many State legislatures, both houses of representatives of the States and the senates. We have heard from local governments. I have a list here of many pages, I will not read through them, Mr. Speaker, but we have heard from industry. We have heard from labor unions that are in favor.

I would say to my friends who work with the labor unions, the IBEW opposes these standards. The IUOE opposes these standards. The boiler-makers union opposes these standards. The bakery, tobacco and confectionery union opposes these standards. The labor unions oppose these standards. United Mine Workers union opposes these standards. All of those have sent letters to the White House or to the EPA.

Other internationals who oppose but have not yet written letters, we hope that they will, include the Teamsters, the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Energy Organization, carpenters, pipe fitters, we understand many other labor unions are getting on board.

The only labor union that we know that is in favor of these standards, and I cannot figure out for the life of me, the steel workers. I met with the steel workers this week in an effort to try to understand this, because my local steel workers back in Pittsburgh are not for this. The regional directors, who have watched the steel industry move offshore, are not for this.

The Washington lobbyists for the steel workers are for this. I do not know if someday they want to be Secretary of Labor under somebody's administration. I do not know that. It is only conjecture by a cynical television reporter who now is standing here in Congress. I do not know what the reason is.

But the point of it is this, I have been almost all of my adult life a union member, still carry my AFL-CIO card. In acting on behalf of the working people of my region, which is what I was sent here to do, I cannot go along with these proposed new standards. They make no sense. It is bad news environmentally. It is bad news from a health perspective. It is bad news certainly from a wealth perspective from the continuing prosperity of this country moving forward.

We have loved it during the past 5 years as we have watched the stock market go up and industrial investments going up. It is coming into our area; we are starting to see growth and development. I am afraid that the brakes are going to go on.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my friends in this Congress, I would ask that we have as many Members as can sign onto the bill that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BOUCHER], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. UPTON] and I will be dropping tomorrow, because we think there should be a 5-year moratorium on any action by the EPA.

We think there should be a moratorium until these monitors can be put in place, the study can be done, the material from that study can be fully analyzed and that we will know 5 years from now what we are doing. What is the cost of doing that? We are going to have to fund each year the study. We are going to have to fund the building of those monitors. That will cost far less than what it will cost if the EPA implements these new standards and they are wrong.

We are willing in a bipartisan fashion to fund that study. We have talked about it. We think it is the right thing to do. I would urge my friends to join me.

THE VA'S BEST KEPT SECRET: VETERAN'S ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. CHRISTENSEN]. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. QUINN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for a short period of time here, 4 or 5 minutes, to inform my colleagues in

the House about a veterans' congressional jobs program that has come to my attention and we have initiated in my district office.

This is information for our colleagues here in Congress and for their staff members, and the chairman of the Subcommittee on Benefits of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs here in the House.

Back in January and February, Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to meet with staff over at the VA and talk about the existing programs. We talked about financing and the budget that is coming up. I also know that most of us as Federal Representatives here in the Congress are committed to improving veterans' employment opportunities, and I think that the Members here will be very interested that the VA is offering a jobs program for service-connected disabled veterans.

This is an existing program that I believe is a win-win-win situation, Mr. Speaker. I think it is one of the VA's best kept secrets, not purposefully; but I think that, if Members know about it and if they are informed about it, they are going to be very excited about it for the district offices and serving our constituents and helping the employment picture for veterans back home in their districts.

That is why it was important for me to come to the floor today and to speak to our colleagues and our Members. This program is referred to as the Chapter 31 Program. The purpose of the VA's vocational rehabilitation program is to assist service-disabled veterans find and maintain suitable employment. The trainee receives a stipend from the VA. In other words, there is no additional cost to us in our district offices.

I mentioned before that I think it is a win-win-win situation because it has helped the effectiveness of my office. It has helped us with our constituent service. It is also a win then for the individual veteran who has an opportunity to experience this on-the-job training, and I believe it is a win for the community at large.

The VA has done an excellent job in finding a candidate to work in my congressional office back in our district. We selected a trainee, Mr. Mark Dunford, who has a bachelor's degree in history, and he is completing his prelaw work at Canisius College in Buffalo. He has agreed to take on all our constituent work relating to veterans.

When we have constituents call our offices that want some help with either hospital veterans benefits or problems with some benefits they are receiving for a previously expired husband or wife, this is the kind of individual that will take that constituent work and get it done.

He is doing an outstanding job, Mr. Dunford is. His experience and skills acquired in the military are an asset to our office. But when he is assisting in constituent work, when he is monitoring the needs that people in my district

and all of our districts have with regard to veterans affairs, he is one of those take-charge people who gets it done.

This on-the-job training program is an excellent way for disabled veterans to gain the work experience that they need.

I think, finally, that it is an opportunity for those of us who are Members of Congress here to lead by example. It is an opportunity to take this congressional job training experience another step and allow our veterans to have that experience so they can get meaningful employment either in our offices or in other places around the community.

In a time of limited resources, Mr. Speaker, it is also an opportunity for us to provide this job at no additional costs to our congressional payrolls. I think it is a win-win-win situation, as I said, for everybody involved.

I came to the floor today to make our Members aware of this program. As I mentioned, it is called the Chapter 31 Program. Later this week I will be sending a dear colleague letter to all of our Members here in the House suggesting that they look into the program. They can very easily give my staff a call in my office so we can put them in touch with the right people in the VA who, to tell you the truth, handle everything for us.

It is a great program. It is one that our constituents should know about. It is one that will help us run our offices more effectively and more efficiently. Finally, it is the right thing to do for some veterans back in our districts.

I would suggest that with the dear colleague letter that goes out from our office later this week, if anybody needs any attention from us or any help, we stand ready to do that, as does the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time this afternoon to make my office available.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 12 o'clock and 45 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1119, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998 AND 1999

Mr. MCINNIS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report

(Rept. No. 105-137) on the resolution (H. Res. 169) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL of Ohio) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BONIOR, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HALL of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEVIN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WYNN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROTHMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CANADY of Florida) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. QUINN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NEUMANN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ENSIGN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TIAHRT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RIGGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WAXMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. NORTHUP, for 5 minutes, today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

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

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

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. HOBSON.

Mr. QUINN.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

Mr. PACKARD.

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

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

Mr. SANDERS.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

Mr. UNDERWOOD.

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

Mr. VENTO.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

Mr. CLAY.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. STUPAK.

Mr. WELLER.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. FORBES.

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

Mr. KUCINICH.

Mr. POSHARD.

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. THOMPSON.

Mr. OLVER.

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

Mr. EWING.

Mr. VELÁZQUEZ.

Mr. BROWN of California.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to consent to certain amendments enacted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 342. An act to extend certain privileges, exemptions, and immunities to Hong Kong Economic and Trade Offices.

JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H.J. Res. 32. Joint resolution to consent to certain amendments enacted by the Legislature of the State of Hawaii to the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, 1920.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 47 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Thursday, June 19, 1997, at 10 a.m.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from

the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3845. A letter from the Director, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revitalizing Base Closure Communities and Community Assistance—Community Redevelopment and Homeless Assistance (RIN: 0790-AG18) received June 9, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

3846. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Office of the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Office's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Miscellaneous Amendments [Defense Acquisition Circular 91-12] received June 16, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on National Security.

3847. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board, transmitting the annual report of the Thrift Depositor Protection Oversight Board on the Resolution Funding Corporation for the calendar year 1996, pursuant to Public Law 101-73, section 511(a) (103 Stat. 404); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

3848. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Controls and Displays (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration) [Docket No. 96-52; Notice 2] (RIN: 2127-AF86) received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3849. A letter from the Chair, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Nuclear Plant Decommissioning Trust Fund Guidelines [Docket No. RM94-14-001; Order No. 580-A] received June 13, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

3850. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting the Department of the Navy's proposed lease of defense articles to Chile (Transmittal No. 19-97), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2796a(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

3851. A letter from the Chairman, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, transmitting the Authority's report entitled "District of Columbia Financial Plan and Budget, Fiscal Years 1998 and 1999-2001," pursuant to Public Law 104-8, section 202(c)(6) (109 Stat. 113); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3852. A letter from the CFO and Plan Administrator, PCA Retirement Committee, First South Production Credit Association, transmitting the fiscal year 1996 annual pension plan report of the First South Production Credit Association, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

3853. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the study report on the El Camino Real de Tierra Adentro to determine if it is feasible and desirable to designate it as a component of the National Trails System, pursuant to 16 U.S.C. 1244(b); to the Committee on Resources.

3854. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the annual report entitled "Outer Continental Shelf Lease Sales: Evaluation of Bidding Results and Competition" for fiscal year 1996, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1337(a)(9); to the Committee on Resources.

3855. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Low-Stress

Hazardous Liquid Pipelines Serving Plants and Terminals (Research and Special Programs Administration) [Docket No. PS-117; Amdt. 195-57] (RIN: 2137-AC87) received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3856. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Motor Carrier Routing Regulations; Disposition of Loss and Damage Claims and Processing Salvage; Preservation of RECORDS (Federal Highway Administration) (RIN: 2125-AE12) received June 12, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3857. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Government Securities: Call for Large Position Reports [17 CFR Part 420] received June 10, 1997, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3858. A letter from the United States Trade Representative, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Trade Act of 1974 to extend the Generalized System of Preferences; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3859. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Department's report on the utilization of Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences (USUHS) graduates, pursuant to Public Law 104-201 section 741(e) (110 Stat. 2600); jointly to the Committees on National Security and Commerce.

3860. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's report on the Portfolio Re-engineering Demonstration Program for Fiscal Years 1996 and 1997, pursuant to Public Law 104-134, section 210(g) (110 Stat. 1321-287); jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Appropriations.

3861. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting a report on deliveries under Section 540 of P.L. 104-107 to the Government of Bosnia-Herzegovina, pursuant to Public Law 104-107, section 540(c) (110 Stat. 736); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

3862. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to improve pension and benefit security, to provide equitable railroad retirement benefits; jointly to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Ways and Means, Government Reform and Oversight, and Transportation and Infrastructure.

3863. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide uniform safeguards for the confidentiality of information acquired for exclusively statistical purposes, and to improve the efficiency of Federal statistical programs and the quality of federal statistics by permitting limited sharing of records for statistical purposes under strong safeguards; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and Oversight, Commerce, the Judiciary, Science, and Education and the Workforce.

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. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform and Oversight. H.R. 1316. A bill to amend chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to the order of precedence

to be applied in the payment of life insurance benefits; with an amendment (Rept. 105-134). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 858. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct a pilot project on designated lands within Plumas, Lassen, and Tahoe National Forests in the State of California to demonstrate the effectiveness of the resource management activities proposed by the Quincy Library Group and to amend current land and resource management plans for these national forests to consider the incorporation of these resource management activities; with an amendment (Rept. 105-136, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted June 19 (Legislative day of June 18), 1997]

Mr. SOLOMON: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 169. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1119) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 1998 and 1999 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 1998 and 1999, and for other purposes (Rept. 105-137). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Agriculture discharged from further consideration. H.R. 858 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTED BILLS SEQUENTIALLY REFERRED

Under clause 5 of rule X, bills and reports were delivered to the Clerk for printing, and bills referred as follows:

Mr. GOSS: Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. H.R. 1775. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1998 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the U.S. Government, the community management account, and the Central Intelligence Agency retirement and disability system, and for other purposes; with an amendment; referred to the Committee on National Security for a period ending not later than July 1, 1997, for consideration of such provisions of the bill and amendment as fall within the jurisdiction of that committee pursuant to clause 1(k), rule X. (Rept. 105-135, Pt. 1).

BILLS PLACED ON THE CORRECTIONS CALENDAR

Under clause 4 of rule XIII, the Speaker filed with the Clerk a notice requesting that the following bills be placed upon the Corrections Calendar:

H.R. 1316. A bill to amend chapter 87 of title 5, United States Code, with respect to the order of precedence to be applied in the payment of life insurance benefits.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 858. Referral to the Committee on Agriculture extended for a period ending not later than June 18, 1997.

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 Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD (for herself and Mrs. MYRICK):

H.R. 1950. A bill to clarify the family violence option under the temporary assistance to needy families program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TORRES (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. LEACH, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. VALÁZQUEZ, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. BOUCHER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H.R. 1951. A bill to make an exception to the United States embargo on trade with Cuba for the export of food, medicines, medical supplies, medical instruments, or medical equipment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions of fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CANNON:

H.R. 1952. A bill to designate certain Bureau of Land Management lands in the State of Utah as wilderness, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GEKAS:

H.R. 1953. A bill to clarify State authority to tax compensation paid to certain employees; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENKINS:

H.R. 1954. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on certain high tenacity single yarn of viscose rayon; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KNOLLENBERG (for himself, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 1955. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that a person who is sentenced to life in prison or death pursuant to Federal law forfeits all veterans' gratuitous benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. SABO:

H.R. 1956. A bill to amend sections 226 and 226A of the Social Security Act to provide for entitlement to Medicare benefits of any divorced individual who otherwise would be so entitled on the basis of the entitlement to wife's, husband's, widow's, or widower's insurance benefits but for the failure to meet the 10-year marriage requirement, if such individual has been married to any 2 fully insured individuals for a total period of 10 years; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 1957. A bill to amend the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978 to exempt voluntary child custody proceedings from coverage under that act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. WHITFIELD:

H.R. 1958. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the act of March 16, 1950, and the Federal Trade Commission Act to end the regulation of margarine; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DEUTSCH (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H. Con. Res. 100. Concurrent resolution relating to the future status of Taiwan after Hong Kong's transfer to the People's Republic of China on July 1, 1997; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON (for himself and Mr. CARDIN):

H. Res. 168. Resolution to implement the recommendations of the bipartisan House Ethics Reform Task Force; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

134. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 11 urging Congress to protect the rights of users of roads over public lands; to the Committee on Resources.

135. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 53 memorializing the U.S. Congress to appropriate funds for the replacement of the Chickamauga Lock; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. WHITFIELD introduced a bill (H.R. 1959) for the relief of Dr. David Robert Zetter, Dr. Sabina Emily Seitz, and Daniel Robert Zetter; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 51: Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 58: Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. WELLER.
 H.R. 123: Mr. WICKER and Mr. ROGERS.
 H.R. 165: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 195: Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 218: Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. LEWIS of California, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.
 H.R. 234: Mr. BORSKI, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FROST, and Mr. YATES.
 H.R. 235: Mr. WEXLER.
 H.R. 336: Mr. MCKEON.
 H.R. 339: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. CANADY of Florida.
 H.R. 418: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. JACKSON.
 H.R. 457: Mr. CAPPS.
 H.R. 475: Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SESSIONS, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
 H.R. 519: Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.
 H.R. 586: Mr. SESSIONS.
 H.R. 617: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. JACKSON, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 705: Mr. CANADY of Florida.
 H.R. 712: Mr. PAYNE.
 H.R. 754: Mr. MCINTYRE and Mr. CLYBURN.
 H.R. 793: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 872: Mr. BALLENGER and Mr. COBLE.
 H.R. 955: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. SOUDER, and Mrs. NORTHUP.
 H.R. 978: Mr. LATOURETTE.
 H.R. 1013: Mr. BAKER, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. GOODE, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. MCINNIS.
 H.R. 1068: Mr. CANNON and Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 H.R. 1072: Mr. OLVER, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
 H.R. 1077: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. GOODLING.
 H.R. 1108: Mr. GOODE.
 H.R. 1114: Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 1120: Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. MILLER of California, and Mr. SERRANO.
 H.R. 1126: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
 H.R. 1127: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. SMITH of Oregon.
 H.R. 1134: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Ms. MOLINARI, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. CLAYTON.
 H.R. 1142: Mr. STUPAK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. ACKERMAN.
 H.R. 1147: Mr. COOKSEY.
 H.R. 1153: Mr. GOODLING and Ms. GRANGER.
 H.R. 1159: Mr. VENTO and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
 H.R. 1165: Mr. HILLIARD.
 H.R. 1186: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
 H.R. 1202: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. ROTHMAN.
 H.R. 1232: Mr. FAZIO of California, Mr. DELUMS, Mr. KILDEE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.
 H.R. 1263: Mr. LANTOS.
 H.R. 1270: Mr. EHRlich, Mr. THOMPSON, Mr. PARKER, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Mr. DOOLITTLE.
 H.R. 1279: Mr. SHAW.
 H.R. 1311: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. BROWN of California.
 H.R. 1329: Mr. HALL of Ohio.
 H.R. 1335: Mr. BACHUS and Mr. BENTSEN.
 H.R. 1346: Mr. DELLUMS and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
 H.R. 1350: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BUNNING of Kentucky, Mr. PORTER, Mr. STUMP, Mr. KIM, and Mr. CHABOT.
 H.R. 1369: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 1391: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BLUNT, Ms. DANNER, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WELLER, Mr. BARCIA of Michigan, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. PORTER, Mr. POMBO, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CAPPS, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 1398: Mr. HYDE and Mr. SALMON.
 H.R. 1438: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
 H.R. 1440: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. FALCOMAEGA.
 H.R. 1458: Mr. NORWOOD.
 H.R. 1478: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. JOHNSON of Wisconsin, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1505: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 1542: Mr. RIGGS.
 H.R. 1567: Mr. PACKARD, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. STUMP, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado.
 H.R. 1627: Mrs. MORELLA.
 H.R. 1660: Mr. SMITH of Michigan.
 H.R. 1679: Mr. CALLAHAN.
 H.R. 1702: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. SALMON, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. FOLEY.
 H.R. 1727: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MOLINARI, and Mr. BALDACCIO.
 H.R. 1754: Ms. RIVERS and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
 H.R. 1763: Mr. NEY.
 H.R. 1765: Mr. SANDERS.
 H.R. 1810: Mrs. NORTHUP, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. EHRlich, and Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 1816: Mr. MCINTOSH.
 H.R. 1818: Mr. BONIOR.
 H.R. 1839: Mr. SHAYS.
 H.R. 1842: Mr. GUTKNECHT.
 H.R. 1877: Mr. HAYWORTH.
 H.R. 1883: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Mr. SCHUMER.
 H.R. 1908: Mr. CALLAHAN.
 H.J. Res. 76: Mr. NEY.
 H.J. Res. 79: Mr. DEFAZIO.
 H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. KILPATRICK.
 H. Con. Res. 52: Mr. MOLLOHAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H. Con. Res. 75: Mr. COLLINS.
 H. Con. Res. 80: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. SCHUMER.
 H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. FORBES, Mr. SOLOMON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. KLING, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CAPPS, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. CRANE, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MANTON, Ms. HARMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. OLVER, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
 H. Res. 26: Mr. YATES, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. STARK, and Mr. DEUTSCH.
 H. Res. 103: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. CALVERT.
 H. Res. 135: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ACKERMAN, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. EVANS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. WISE, and Mr. DOYLE.
 H. Res. 138: Mr. ETHERIDGE.
 H. Res. 151: Mr. POMEROY and Mr. DEFAZIO.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

18. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the Council of the County of Hawaii, Hilo, Hawaii, relative to Resolution No. 79-97 urging strong support for the passage of H.R. 627 and S. 290, establishing a three-year visa waiver pilot program for Korean nationals visiting the United States in tour groups; to the Committee on the Judiciary.